

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 675

EA 004 078

TITLE Special Revenue Sharing: An Analysis of the Administration's Grant Consolidation Proposals. Information Report.

INSTITUTION Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C.

REPORT NO M-70

PUB DATE Dec 71

NOTE 70p.

AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (\$.40)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29

DESCRIPTORS *Educational Finance; *Educational Legislation; *Federal Aid; *Federal Programs; *Grants; Program Proposals

IDENTIFIERS Revenue Sharing

ABSTRACT

Special revenue sharing is one aspect of the Administration's response to the fiscal and administrative complexity of the present structure of federal categorical grants-in-aid to state and local governments. Because of some rather widespread misunderstanding about the nature and objectives of the six special revenue sharing proposals, this information report describes them in detail and discusses some of the implications of those proposals. (Author)

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS
October 8, 1971

Private Citizens:

Robert E. Merriam, Chicago, Illinois, Chairman
Howard H. Callaway, Pine Mountain, Georgia
Edward C. Banfield, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Members of the United States Senate:

Sam J. Ervin, Jr., North Carolina
Karl E. Mundt, South Dakota
Edmund S. Muskie, Maine

Members of the United States House of Representatives:

Florence P. Dwyer, Mrs., New Jersey
L. H. Fountain, North Carolina
Al Ullman, Oregon

Officers of the Executive Branch, Federal Government:

Robert H. Finch, Counsellor to the President
George Romney, Secretary, Housing and Urban Development
George P. Shultz, Director, Office of Management and Budget

Governors:

Dale Bumpers, Arkansas
Warren E. Hearnes, Missouri
Richard B. Ogilvie, Illinois
Ronald Reagan, California

Mayors:

C. Beverly Briley, Nashville, Tennessee
Lawrence F. Kramer, Jr., Paterson, New Jersey
Richard G. Lugar, Indianapolis, Indiana, Vice Chairman
Jack Maltester, San Leandro, California

Members of State Legislative Bodies:

W. Russell Arrington, Senator, Illinois
B. Mahlon Brown, Senator, Nevada
Robert P. Knowles, Senator, Wisconsin

Elected County Officials:

Conrad M. Fowler, Shelby County, Alabama
Edwin G. Michaelian, Westchester County, New York
Lawrence K. Roos, St. Louis County, Missouri

ED 058675

Information Report

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Special Revenue Sharing: An Analysis of the Administration's Grant Consolidation Proposals

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20575
December 1971
M-70

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 • Price 40 cents

Preface

Special revenue sharing is one aspect of the Administration's response to the fiscal and administrative complexity of the present structure of Federal categorical grants-in-aid to State and local governments.

Because of some rather widespread misunderstanding about the nature and objectives of the six special revenue sharing proposals, this information report describes them in some detail and discusses some of the implications of the main features of those proposals.

Although the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has not endorsed any specific "special revenue sharing" proposals, it has consistently pressed for both grant consolidation and the need to build far greater flexibility into our Federal aid structure.

This volume contains no recommendations or suggestions. It is offered solely as an informational document. The Commission authorized publication of this report at its meeting October 8, 1971.

ROBERT E. MERRIAM
Chairman

Acknowledgments

Responsibility for the staff work was shared by Jacob M. Jaffe and Carl W. Stenberg. The project was supervised by John Shannon and David B. Walker.

Wm. R. MacDOUGALL
Executive Director

Contents

Preface	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
Why Special Revenue Sharing?	1
Objectives of Special Revenue Sharing	5
Main Features of Special Revenue Sharing	8
Comparison with Traditional Block Grants	9
Law Enforcement Assistance: Conversion of a Block Grant to Special Revenue Sharing	10
Additional Features Common to All Six Programs	11
Features Unique to Particular Special Revenue Programs	12
Implications of Eliminating Matching Provisions	15
Potential Magnitude with Matching	16
Implications of New Allocation Formulas	19
Project Grants	20
Formula Grants	20
"Hold Harmless" Provisions	21
Financial Effects of Allocation Formulas	22
Implications of Planning and Administrative Provisions	24
State Plans and Program Statements	24
Channeling-Bypassing	25
Areawide Planning	26
Local Government Planning	26
Accountability	27
To Sum Up	27

APPENDICES

A. Sources of Special Revenue Sharing Funds	29
B. Law Enforcement Assistance: Proposed Conversion of a Block Grant to Special Revenue Sharing	32
C. Selected Features of Special Revenue Sharing Programs	37
D. Matching Requirements and Allocation Formulas of Major Categorical Grants Covered into Special Revenue Sharing Programs	45
E. Tabulations of "Hold Harmless" Baselines and Special Revenue Sharing Allocations, by Program and by State	55
F. Comparative Planning Features of The Administration's Special Revenue Sharing Proposals	62

Why Special Revenue Sharing?

"Special revenue sharing" is the term President Nixon used in his January 22, 1971 State of the Union Message to herald a drastic revision of Federal aid to State and local governments. The heart of this approach is the consolidation of some 130 existing categorical grants into six broad purpose packages. This plan would provide \$11 billion with few strings and no required matching to help States and localities finance education, law enforcement, manpower training, rural community development, transportation, and urban community development.*

* As submitted in the Budget for fiscal 1972, the total amount proposed for revenue sharing is \$13.6 billion (\$3.8 billion for *general* revenue sharing and \$9.9 billion for *special* revenue sharing), assuming that these programs were to be enacted effective in October 1971 (for general revenue sharing) or January 1, 1972 (for special revenue sharing). This would represent about 35% of the \$38.3 billion in Federal aid to States and localities proposed for fiscal 1972 in the 1972 Budget. See Schultze, Fried, Rivlin and Teeters, *Setting National Priorities, the 1972 Budget* (Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1971) pp. 20-22. It should be noted that in announcing the Administration's New Economic Policy, effective August 16, 1971, President Nixon called for a three-month postponement of

Enactment of this plan would create a completely new Federal aid instrument. Its program focus distinguishes special revenue sharing from the President's proposed \$5 billion general revenue sharing program. Its relaxed fiscal, program, and reporting requirements, with consequent broadened latitude for State and local decision-making, also distinguish it from block or categorical grants.

Three factors led the Administration to propose this basic change in intergovernmental relations:

(1) The great proliferation of categorical grants has created exceedingly complex relationships between Federal aid grantors and State-local grantees and has tended to distort State and local program priorities.

Federal categorical grants have proliferated, to the point that there are now more than 530 large and small programs, through which was disbursed some \$30 billion to the States and localities during the fiscal year that ended on June 30, 1971. Each of these programs was enacted with a national purpose in mind and is endowed with its own matching and allocation formulas and with a plethora of detailed strings relating to administrative organization, program content, application processing, planning, auditing, and reporting. Excessive red tape and cumbersome processing procedures delay the efforts of financially hard-pressed States and localities to obtain Federal aid needed to deliver essential public services. Moreover, because of the tremendous number and range of grants, many local officials do not know what Federal aid is available, how much, for what purposes, and from whom.

Narrow-purpose, project-oriented categorical programs are not always relevant to State and local needs and priorities. Federal administrators make major decisions regarding spending for projects of State and local concern, and often the availability of fairly "cheap" matching money for undertaking Federal priority programs has a skewing effect on the budgets of recipient jurisdictions. Although it can be argued this is precisely the effect Federal policy makers sought when they imposed matching

general revenue sharing. In his testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee, OMB Director Shultz stated that effective dates for two of the special revenue sharing measures had been postponed also — Transportation to January 1, 1973 and Urban Community Development to July 1, 1972.

conditions, it has also been noted that important non-aided program needs have all too often been neglected because of the resultant diversion of scarce State and local resources to federally-aided programs.

(2) The growing fiscal pressure on State and local treasuries has convinced the Federal Government of the need for increased Federal aid and for relaxing of matching requirements.

Federal aid to State and local governments has almost quintupled in the past decade, from \$8 billion in fiscal 1962 to \$38 billion budgeted for fiscal 1972. In fiscal 1962 it provided a little over 12 per cent of State-local general revenue; by the end of fiscal 1972 it will comprise 22 per cent. Furthermore, there has been a tendency to relax matching requirements in recent years. Thus, where the usual grant program has required the States or local governments to put up one dollar for each Federal dollar, more recent programs call for little or no matching. For example, the massive program for helping school systems educate disadvantaged children (Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I) requires no matching, and most of the new manpower training programs call for only 10 per cent matching.

(3) Traditional approaches to grant-in-aid streamlining have failed.

Congress has been unwilling to authorize the President to submit grant consolidation plans in accordance with a procedure similar to that used for reorganization proposals, under which plans would go into effect automatically if Congress did not act within 90 days. In the 91st Congress, grant consolidation proposals for comprehensive headstart child development, water and sewer facilities, library services and construction, housing and urban development, and education programs were not passed and, indeed, rarely progressed as far as the hearing stage. Furthermore, Congress recently has recategorized certain programs which at one time were heralded as consolidated or block grants — the Partnership for Health Act of 1966, the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, and Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

The Administration's special revenue sharing proposals reject the concept of incremental change. A former Assistant Director of

the Office of Management and Budget has indicated a basic obstacle to such reform efforts:*

... The problem simply put, is that this approach doesn't work. Let me use an illustration. In 1969, the Administration proposed the consolidation of several narrow library grants. The Congress resisted, and the reason was simple. It can be expressed quantitatively: 99.99% of the public is not interested in library grant reform. Of the .01% who are interested, all are librarians and oppose it.

Hence, the most feasible "game plan" was a complete overhaul of Federal aid to State and local governments. By seriously disrupting the functional *status quo* and directly challenging the security of the various bureaucratic fiefdoms that have built up over the years around narrow-purpose programs, the Administration puts the functionalists on the defensive. In the past these officials and their legislative allies could with ease kill the relatively small-scale and innocuous consolidation proposals before they saw the light of day. Special revenue sharing, however, is a widely publicized, broad-based bid for popular support for institutional change. It carries with it a persuasive message – take power, funds, and decision-making away from the Federal bureaucracy and return them to the States, the localities, and the people who, after all, know best how to apply resources to meet their particular needs and preferences.

* Richard P. Nathan, "Special Revenue Sharing: Simple, Neat, and Correct" *State Government Administration*, July/August 1971.

Objectives of Special Revenue Sharing

Special revenue sharing has three main purposes: (1) to allow States and localities maximum administrative flexibility in tailoring the use of grant funds to their specific needs and priorities within broad functional areas by eliminating or reducing drastically the administrative processing entailed in applying for Federal grants, in developing and presenting plans for the use of funds, and in detailed reporting on progress; (2) to allow maximum fiscal flexibility by removing matching and maintenance of effort requirements; and (3) to build a potential power base for the enactment of broad Federal aid programs by strengthening the role of the responsible locally-elected generalists — the governors, mayors and county executives — and diminishing the role of the vertical autocracy — the functional specialists at all governmental levels.

To accomplish these objectives the Federal Government would distribute some \$11 billion, without matching requirements, in six areas of broad national concern for which the Congress would set general goals. State and local governments, however, would make the programmatic decisions to carry them out.

The six special revenue sharing programs are as follows:

Program	Amount (billions) (first full year basis)	Number of programs folded in *
Education	\$ 3.0	33
Transportation	2.6	26
Urban Community Development	2.1	12
Manpower Training	2.0	17
Rural Community Development	1.1	39
Law Enforcement	0.5	2
Total	\$11.3	129

Grants would be repackaged to complement the other two elements of President Nixon's proposed reform of the governmental machinery for delivering domestic public services — general revenue sharing and reorganization of the Executive Branch. On the one hand, special revenue sharing programs (bolstered by general revenue sharing) would be designed to provide State and local government maximum flexibility in providing services in the context of broad national goals with minimum interference from the Federal Government. On the other hand, consolidation of the seven Departments concerned with domestic affairs into four with broad program responsibilities would provide a logical framework for this new kind of intergovernmental aid relationship.

The following chart shows the status of the various special revenue sharing measures in Congress, as of early November, 1971.

* See Appendix A.

Status of Special Revenue Sharing Bills, November 1971

Program	Bill	Committee	Subcommittee	Hearings Begun	Hearings Complete	Vote
Education	S. 1669	Labor & Public Welfare	Education	✓		
	H.R. 7796	Education & Labor				
Law Enforcement	S. 1087	Judiciary	Criminal Laws & Procedures			
	H.R. 5408	Judiciary	Subcommittee No. 5			
Manpower	S. 1243	Labor & Public Welfare	Employment, Manpower & Poverty	✓		
	H.R. 6181	Education & Labor	Select Subcommittee on Labor			
Rural Develop.	S. 1612	Agriculture & Forestry	Rural Development	✓	✓	
	H.R. 7993	Government Operations				
Transportation	S. 1693	Commerce				
Urban Develop.	S. 1618	Banking, Housing & Urban Affairs		✓	✓	
	H.R. 8853	Banking & Currency		✓	✓	

Source: ACIR staff compilation.

Main Features of Special Revenue Sharing

In a way, the use of the term "special revenue sharing" to label the six new grant programs being proposed by the Administration is unfortunate. They are not revenue sharing in the technical sense of general revenue sharing in that the amounts available to fund them are not tied directly to the growth of one or more Federal revenue sources.*

The term has been a source of confusion, especially because of the highly publicized significance of the automatic growth feature of general revenue sharing through its direct tie to the Federal personal income tax. Financing of *special* revenue sharing depends on specific budget requests by the President and appropriation action by Congress. Aside from the nature of their funding, however, the special revenue sharing programs do have a basic goal that is similar to that of general revenue sharing. They aim at shifting many of the detailed decisions for carrying out

* The Transportation grant is an exception, as it is funded in part from the highway and airport and airway trust funds. However, its funding is subject to the granting by Congress of specific obligational authority and appropriations.

domestic programs from the Federal Government to the States and local governments.

All six special revenue sharing programs have certain characteristics in common. For the most part those characteristics, which are discussed in the following sections, have been embodied in the proposals to carry out the Administration's goal of providing flexibility and administrative simplicity in the conduct of federally-aided programs.

Comparison with Traditional Block Grants

It will be useful first to consider the similarities and differences between special revenue sharing and the traditional block grants. Four characteristics that are common to all six special revenue sharing proposals can be singled out for this purpose.

Grant consolidation — Like the traditional block grant each of the special revenue sharing programs is constructed by folding in a number of related categorical grant programs. In both instances, this involves a thorough review of the candidates for consolidation with the result that some may be discarded as having outlived their usefulness, others updated to meet changing conditions, and still others continued substantially in the same form. The process also furnishes an opportunity to re-evaluate the allocation factors and to revise them where necessary.

By its very nature, grant consolidation — whether as a traditional block grant or special revenue sharing — allows more flexible use of the grant money than would the previous narrowly defined grants. But here, the two kinds of grant consolidation part company, for the traditional block grant would retain most of the administrative rigidity and Federal controls inherent in categorical grants. Special revenue sharing would eliminate or modify them.

Matching and maintenance of effort — Almost all Federal grant programs now require State or local governments to match Federal funds as a condition for obtaining the grant. Many are flat matching grants, applicable nationwide (for example, 50 per cent Federal, 50 per cent State or local; 75 per cent Federal, 25 per cent State or local). Others call for variable matching, where the State or local matching share varies inversely with some measure of the jurisdiction's ability to finance the program. The matching requirement can have the effect of diverting State and local funds away from non-aided programs, thus distorting State and local

budget priorities. To avoid such budgetary distortion, none of the special revenue sharing programs requires matching. Also, since a maintenance of effort requirement would have the same effect as matching, no such requirement is included in special sharing.*

Automatic distribution — Once the special revenue sharing funds are allocated among the eligible recipients by a statutory formula, they are paid over automatically. There would be no need for States and localities to file detailed applications, as is now the case where the grant is to be used for specific projects as for highways, mass transit, sewer and water grants and urban renewal.

Minimal administrative strings — As has been noted, the filing of detailed applications for grant funds would be a thing of the past under special revenue sharing. To the extent that plans are required, they would be subject only to review and comment by Federal agencies. In other words, no prior Federal approval would be required to obtain grant funds. Each of the programs contains a provision for accountability as to the proper use of funds and Federal officials are authorized to audit the accounts. Basically, however, publication of plans and annual reports is to provide for disclosure to and scrutiny by the local citizenry, similar to the public scrutiny now provided under State law.

Law Enforcement Assistance: Conversion of a Block Grant to Special Revenue Sharing

Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 established the Federal Government's first comprehensive intergovernmental crime reduction program. Instead of assisting State and local governments through categorical grants — the typical approach taken by Congress during the 1960's — the Act authorized block grants for them to use in meeting their law enforcement and criminal justice administration needs.

The proposed conversion of the "Safe Streets Act of 1971," then, affords a unique opportunity to examine the differences between block grants and special revenue sharing. As indicated in Appendix B, substantial differences do exist between these two approaches in terms of the flexibility accorded to States and localities in planning, funding, executing, and monitoring anti-

* With one exception — the Rural Community Development proposal does include an effort maintenance provision in regard to agricultural extension.

crime programs. At the same time, the case study underscores that special revenue sharing cannot be considered altogether as "no strings" money, although the extent of congressional and Federal agency influence here would be considerably less than under the present block grant program. Congress would still have a strong voice in determining the State-local distribution of funds, giving preference to crime reduction efforts in certain areas, and restricting the amounts of funds that could be used for specific purposes.

Additional Features Common to all Six Programs

Four additional common characteristics are worth noting.

Adherence to Federal civil rights and labor standards — Each of the proposals contains explicit language to the effect that any State or local activities financed out of special revenue sharing funds are subject to the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and (in the case of construction projects) to the prevailing wage-rate provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act. These are standard provisions generally applicable to federally-aided activities.

Discretionary fund for Federal grant administrator — In each case a discretionary fund (ranging from 10 to 20 per cent of the amount appropriated, depending on the program) is made available to the administering Federal agency. These funds may be used for innovative and demonstration grants (or direct Federal expenditure) related directly to the purposes of the basic program. The discretionary funds may also be used to bring the basic grant to any particular jurisdiction up to the "hold harmless" baseline.

"Hold harmless" provision — Because the allocation formulas for special revenue sharing differ in some respects from those under the previous categorical grants, it is anticipated that special revenue sharing funds allocated to some jurisdictions might be less than the amounts they received under the previous programs. The "hold harmless" provisions (implicit in the use of discretionary funds, although not explicitly provided in the proposed legislation) would guarantee — at least during the transitional period — that no jurisdiction would receive less under special revenue sharing than it did during a designated "base period" under the folded-in programs.

Advance Congressional consent for interstate compacts — All but one of the special revenue sharing measures — Law Enforce-

ment — contain provisions giving advance congressional consent to interstate compacts and agreements necessary for realizing the full potential of the various programs.

Features Unique to Particular Special Revenue Sharing Programs

Each of the special revenue sharing programs is designed to meet a different problem or set of problems in a broad area of national concern. It is to be expected, therefore, that certain provisions — such as those concerning the nature of the clientele to be served and the factors determining allocation of Federal funds among the recipient jurisdictions — would be tailored for each program. There are also some significant differences in the way the six programs are funded.

Recipient jurisdictions — Grants for Urban Community Development are made only to local governments and for Rural Community Development, only to State governments. Under the other programs, they are available to both State and local governments — to the latter either directly or by mandated passthrough in allocation formulas. Two of the programs — Manpower and Transportation — offer grants to consortia of local governments, in each case with a 10 per cent bonus. See Appendix C for details.

Allocation formulas — Since funds are distributed automatically on the basis of statutory allocation formulas, the nature of these formulas is critical. Each program has its unique set of allocation factors, designed ostensibly to measure relative need for grant funds. Thus, built into the Manpower Training program are such factors as the size of the labor force, unemployment rates and number of low income individuals over 16 years of age. Urban Community Development applies the extent of housing overcrowding and housing deficiencies and the number of families below the poverty level. Rural population and rural per capita income are factors in the Rural Community Development Program. See Appendix C for details.

Funding provisions — Four of the programs provide the standard authorization for annual appropriations, but without dollar limits and without any terminal dates. The other two — Education and Transportation — provide for advance funding, but each in its own way, related to provisions under some of the folded-in programs. Authorization for appropriations one year in advance has been a feature for the past several years in the

substantive legislation establishing grants for elementary and secondary seducation of disadvantaged children. This feature has been carried into the special revenue sharing program for Education. Similarly, the advance obligational authority long a feature of the Federal Aid Highway Program and recently included in grants for airports and mass transportation is built into the funding provisions of Transportation special revenue sharing. Specifically, the proposed legislation for Transportation provides obligational authority of \$1.3 billion for fiscal 1972 and \$2.8 billion for each of the fiscal years 1973 through 1975, and further authorizes appropriation of the necessary funds to liquidate the obligations as work progresses. Another feature of the Transportation program is the need to preserve the integrity of the highway and airport and airway trust funds. This is done by appropriating amounts from those two funds only to the extent that obligations are incurred for highway-related or aviation-related activities.

Other unique features — In some of the special revenue sharing programs the flexibility rule has been relaxed somewhat in order to retain the national interest aspect of certain ongoing programs. Examples of such treatment can be found in the programs for Education, Transportation and Rural Community Development.

The allocation formula for Education requires portions of the appropriated funds to be applied to specific uses inherent in certain grant programs now on the books. Thus, a specific amount is set aside on account of "impact A" children — that is, children who reside on Federal property. This amount must be passed on only to those school districts that serve such children. There is a similar set-aside for "impact B" children — those whose parent is employed on Federal property but who do not reside there. In the latter case, however, up to 30 per cent of the set-aside may go to school districts that are not affected by such children. The largest part of the Education grant must be used to meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged children — now aided under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Specific sums are also allotted for special education of handicapped children, for vocational education and for supporting materials and textbooks, but up to 30 per cent of the amounts allotted for those purposes may be used for any of the other purposes authorized under Education revenue sharing.

Under the Transportation program, the authorized obligational authority is explicitly divided between mass transportation

on the one hand and highways and airports on the other. Some leeway is allowed the Secretary of Transportation and the States to use part of the highway and airport money allotted to them for mass transportation purposes.

Special treatment is also accorded the Agricultural Extension Service, which is included with Rural Community Development. This is the only instance where the States are required to maintain their previous financial effort. In other words, although there are no specific matching requirements, the long-established Agricultural Extension Service is assured continued existence at least at the level it has attained under the present 50-50 matching program.

Implications of Eliminating Matching Provisions

Matching provisions have the effect of providing a larger total program than Federal dollars alone would buy. In other words, with required 50-50 (dollar for dollar) matching, the program would be at least twice as large as without matching. With 75-25 matching, the program would be one-third larger than without matching. If a State or locality seeks a matching grant, it must be willing to put its own resources into the federally-aided program.

It has been argued that matching requirements make State and local governments spend their own money on programs which they might not consider as meeting their own priority needs — thus distorting their budgetary planning. Eliminating matching requirements — as special revenue sharing does — thus allows States and localities more program flexibility. The other way of enhancing flexibility — also inherent in special revenue sharing — is to broaden the categories for which Federal aid is offered.

The fact that States and local governments are not required to put up their own funds to match special revenue sharing grants does not necessarily mean that they will not continue to do so. The extent that any State or locality will cut back its own financial participation in a program area will depend upon its

particular circumstances and preferences. Thus, one State may wish to hold the line or cut back on its vocational education program while another may decide that it is in its best interest to put more into vocational education. A State might then divert some of its own funds into or out of vocational education in favor of putting more or less into rural community development, for example.

Removal of matching requirements *per se* need not necessarily preclude the use of special revenue sharing as an incentive for States to participate financially in solving urban fiscal problems — or to accomplish any other objective the Federal Government might deem desirable. Thus, the Manpower and Transportation programs offer a 10 percent bonus to consortia of local governments. The amount allocated to a State (or to local governments in the State) could be increased in a similar fashion where a State allocates a specified portion of its own funds to the program. Such a device could be applied, for example, to the urban community development program, just as it is now being applied to Federal aid for construction of waste treatment plants.

Potential Magnitude With Matching

It is estimated that if present matching requirements were built into the special revenue sharing programs the proposed \$11.3 billion of Federal aid would call forth an additional \$5.6 billion of State and local financing for those programs. Federally-aided spending on all six programs taken together would therefore be half again as much as the Federal grants alone, as the following table shows (dollar amounts in billions):

Program	Proposed aid	Magnitude if matching were required (est.)*			Per cent increase in program
		Matching amount	Total		
Education	\$ 3.0	\$1.0	\$4.0		33
Transportation	2.6	2.5	5.1		96
Urban Community Development	2.1	.7	2.8		33
Manpower Training	2.0	.1	2.1		5
Rural Community Development	1.1	1.0	2.1		91
Law Enforcement	.5	.3	.8		60
Total	\$11.3	\$5.6	\$16.9		50

Because the present matching requirements vary considerably among the categorical grants that are folded into the special revenue sharing programs (see Appendix D), the impact would differ for each broad program area. Thus, in Education, where the largest program — aid for educationally deprived children — now requires no matching, application of present matching would increase the program by only one-third.** Similarly, most of the present manpower programs require little or no matching, and for urban renewal, which makes up the bulk of Urban Community Development special revenue sharing, the required local share is generally one-third of the program cost. On the other hand, the categories that would be folded into Transportation and Rural Community Development special revenue sharing now basically require 50-50 matching, so that State and local matching on the same basis would virtually double the magnitude of those two programs.

* At present levels of statutory required matching for programs folded into special revenue sharing.

** Some of the other Education programs, like vocational education, now require States or localities to put up at least half the cost.

Looking at the situation another way, the additional \$5.6 billion of State and local funds that would be forthcoming for the special revenue sharing areas if present matching requirements were included, could be used by the states and localities for other purposes. Indeed, if they preferred, they could apply the entire \$5.6 billion to tax relief by reducing their expenditures by that amount. It is unlikely, however, that this would happen — although some reduction might occur. Because State highway-user taxes are generally dedicated by law to highway purposes, the bulk of the \$2.5 billion of otherwise matching funds would probably still go for transportation purposes. Most other programs going into special revenue sharing are well established by now and presumably fill continuing needs, so that much of the State and local money now devoted to those programs would doubtless continue to be applied to them.

Implications of New Allocation Formulas

An essential feature of special revenue sharing is that the funds are to be distributed to eligible recipients *automatically* in accordance with the applicable statutory allocation formula. Thus, once the grant administering agency made the computations called for by the statutory formula, it would simply send the required amount to each eligible government.

Because each program deals with a distinctive set of governmental activities, each has its own allocation formula aimed at distributing the funds according to the eligible recipient's presumed relative need for the services. Relative need is measured by total population as in the case of Law Enforcement and the mass transit portion of Transportation; by particular segments of the population as in Education, Rural Community Development and Manpower Training; or by housing characteristics as in some portions of Urban Community Development. Details are shown in Appendix C.

Many of the needs measures are carried over from the formulas in the folded-in programs. There are, however, some significant differences.

Project Grants

The major difference occurs in those programs which, as presently constituted, are project grants without any explicit formula allocation among eligible recipients. Among them are such programs as urban renewal, model cities and basic sewer and water facilities (folded into Urban Community Development); neighborhood youth corps, public service careers and concentrated employment (Manpower Training); mass transit (Transportation); and many of the programs proposed for Rural Community Development. Under all these programs the amount a government (or in some cases a private individual or organization) now receives depends on its ability to demonstrate its need when it applies for project funds. Under special revenue sharing, many governmental units (but no private individuals or organizations) which did not apply for funds previously would be receiving Federal monies. Some may not have applied previously because they did not know how to do so, or could not afford to employ application or proposal specialists ("grantsmen"). Others may not have perceived a need for such projects. The latter type may, of course, turn down the funds that are offered under special revenue sharing, in which case those funds would be reallocated among the other eligible recipients.

Formula Grants

There are differences in the way funds are allocated for the formula grants as well. These differences apply to the eligible recipients and the allocation factors.

The highway and airport portion of Transportation is a case in point. The funds for those purposes are allocated among the States somewhat like the present allocation for Federal-aid highways. The main difference is that rural population, a factor in the present formula for the secondary road system, is omitted from the revenue sharing formula. Total population, urban population, area, and mileage of rural delivery routes are retained as allocation factors. However, the allocation for "urban places" is changed. Under the present formula, this allocation is for urban places over 5,000 population. The proposed formula would allocate part of the funds to urban places, as defined by the Bureau of the Census -- which means places with 2,500 or more inhabitants. Moreover, the present highway aid for urban places is

for State use on urban extensions of the federally-aided system (usually spent directly by States). The proposed formula requires the States to pass the urban highway aid through to the urban places which could use the funds for any highway or airport purpose — or possibly even for mass transit purposes.

There are other examples of allocation formula changes. Indeed, the Law Enforcement program is the only one in which the allocation formula does not change at all. For education of deprived children one significant factor is not explicitly included in the statutory formula as it is now — the number of children from families receiving public assistance under aid to families with dependent children (AFDC).^{*} Rural Community Development includes a fiscal capacity factor (per capita income) and a rural population change factor, neither of which is applied in the folded-in programs. Furthermore, some of the programs proposed for Rural Community Development now provide loans and grants directly to private individuals and organizations; the special revenue sharing funds under this program would go only to States, which could themselves make such loans and grants to private individuals if they so desired.

"Hold Harmless" Provisions

It is clear that with the changes in allocation formulas and with the substitution of allocation formulas for straight project grants, special revenue sharing would result in a distribution of grant funds that differs significantly from the present situation. Some governments would receive less than they do now, others may no longer be eligible for certain funds, and still others would receive considerably more than they do under the present programs.

To avoid a sudden decrease or cessation of funds resulting from the transition to special revenue sharing, the Administration has proposed that, at least for a transitional period, no government should receive less under the new program than it did previously. To accomplish this a "hold harmless base line" was established for each program. These base lines vary: some are based on three to

^{*} Presumably, however, the Secretary of HEW could include this factor, as the proposed statutory language gives him the responsibility for defining "low income families," within certain broad guidelines.

five-year averages, others on the amount of grants estimated to be obligated for fiscal year 1971 or 1972, and still others are constructed from a composite of factors.

The tables in Appendix E show the State-by-State baselines and allocations for each of the special revenue sharing programs, as issued by the Office of the White House Press Secretary. The "allocation" columns include the "hold harmless" amounts for those States where application of the statutory special revenue sharing formula results in a shortfall from the baseline.

Financial Effects of Allocation Formulas

An analysis of these tabulations reveals some interesting facts. First, it is obvious that for Education, the general element of Transportation (that is, excluding mass transit), and Law Enforcement the new allocations result in little or no shift in distributions. As was noted above, there were no drastic changes in allocation formulas for these programs and, beyond this, there is little change in the total amounts made available for them.

The most dramatic shifts occur in the mass transit element of Transportation and in Urban Community Development. Both of these programs involve significant increases from their baselines, so that the "hold harmless" provision is generally irrelevant. Beyond this, however, the change from project to formula grants makes for some spectacular situations. Thus, while the communities in almost half of the States have received little or no money under the present mass transit program, every State would receive at least \$250 thousand (the minimum established in the proposed legislation) and many would receive up to four, five and more times the amount they have obtained heretofore. The proposed total distribution is about four times the previous annual average.

Under Urban Community Development, communities in those States that have neither felt the need for urban renewal or model cities funds nor been aggressive in proposing projects, would suddenly find themselves entitled to tremendously increased grants. While the total made available would increase by 67 per cent from the previous annual average, thirteen States would more than double. The grants in South Carolina would increase almost ten-fold, in Montana, nine-fold, in Nebraska almost five-fold, in Nevada more than three-fold, and communities in Florida and Mississippi would be entitled to three times their previous grants. On the other hand, States like Connecticut,

Massachusetts, Minnesota and Rhode Island, which have been pursuing urban renewal objectives vigorously, would obtain little more than under the present programs.

The conclusion might be drawn that the allocation factors built into the Urban Community Development program do indeed measure true program needs.* The communities in States that have been spending considerable sums on urban renewal, model cities and similar programs do obtain somewhat more under the new formula. And it may well be that those communities that receive many times more under the new formula actually do have the need but cannot afford to match Federal funds under the present programs or do not have the expertise to apply for the funds successfully. Further analysis would be required to validate this conclusion and to test the effectiveness of the needs measures that are applied in other programs.

* The four factors, equally weighted, are total population, poverty level population, overcrowding and housing deficiencies.

Implications of Planning and Administrative Provisions

Although each special revenue sharing proposal has a planning component, taken together, they do not provide for a systematic approach to the planning process at the State, areawide, and local levels. Furthermore, the various measures do not reflect any consensus at the Federal level regarding the proper organizational framework for sub-national planning and program administration.

State Plans and Program Statements

As indicated in Appendix F, each special revenue sharing bill would call for the annual submission of a State plan or statement of program objectives and projected uses of funds as a means of triggering payments of Federal aid. The contents of these documents and their relationship with the State level comprehensive planning agency and with ongoing functional planning efforts are not elaborated. Only one measure – Law Enforcement – specifically requires State plans to be comprehensive and provides a very general definition of what is meant by comprehensiveness.

None of the special revenue sharing proposals would authorize Federal approval of State plans or program statements. Instead, the Federal agency concerned is assigned a review and comment role. It remains to be seen whether comments and recommendations by Federal administrators in connection with the contents of State plans will have the same force as the "special conditions" that must now be met by the recipient jurisdiction in order to maintain an uninterrupted flow of Federal aid. The formal approval responsibilities of Federal agencies vis-a-vis State decision-making are limited to sanctioning the data and calculations to be used in determining "pass through" formula allocations.

Some of the measures, however, would provide a degree of Federal influence over the organization and operation of State planning agencies responsible for special revenue sharing programs. The Rural Community Development and Transportation bills, for example, would mandate the establishment of a new statewide planning system, and the appointment of a representative commission to advise the Governor during preparation of a "State development plan." The Education measure would require creation of a State advisory council composed of education professionals and community representatives to help plan and evaluate education programs and offer advice to State and local officials. The composition of this body would be largely determined by the Federal statute. While none of the proposals would stipulate that planning for the various functions folded into special revenue sharing must be conducted by a general purpose State comprehensive planning agency, two — Law Enforcement and Education — would require a single State agency to prepare a statewide plan for each functional area. The proposed legislation is silent regarding State level interagency relationships in comprehensive and functional planning under the programs.

Channeling-Bypassing

The channeling-bypassing issue is highlighted in the Urban and the Rural Community Development measures. While the Rural Community Development legislation provides only for grants to State governments, Title I of the Urban bill would target Federal funds on the Nation's standard metropolitan statistical areas. It is not wholly clear whether these special revenue sharing payments would be made directly to general purpose units of local

government in SMSA's, or would be channeled through the State government. The absence of State community development plan or single State agency requirements, in addition to the present pattern of intergovernmental administrative relationships in the four major HUD programs that would be consolidated under special revenue sharing — urban renewal, model cities, water and sewer grants, and loans for rehabilitation of existing structures — suggest the former approach. Title II of the Urban bill, however, would make Federal assistance available to both States and local governments for improving their planning and management programs, including the preparation of a statewide development plan.

Areawide Planning

All of the special revenue sharing measures except Education would furnish some incentives for areawide planning. Two of these — Transportation and Manpower — would make available bonus funds to "consortia" of applicants, while the others would merely encourage planning by combinations of units of general local government.

The Rural Community Development and Transportation proposals also contain provisions expressly determining the structure of substate planning activities. Both would require the division of a State into a number of multi-jurisdictional planning districts, each with a planning board composed of elected officials designated by constituent general units of local government. One or more members of each board would serve on the State development planning advisory commission. Under the former bill, the Board would be essentially an advisory body to the Governor; in the case of the latter, it also would advise localities as to the relationship of their program plans to areawide and statewide planning efforts.

Local Government Planning

With respect to planning by individual cities and counties, only the Urban Community Development proposal would make available dollar incentives for these jurisdictions to prepare plans, although in all but the Rural Community Development bill they are encouraged to do so. In the Transportation, Urban Community

Development, and Manpower areas, local planning would not only be encouraged but would be required. Submission of a general local government development plan or a statement of program objectives and projected uses of shared revenues, including treatment of local-areawide and local-State interrelationships, would be a necessary condition for receiving Federal funds. Although these local plans and program statements would not be subject to approval by the Federal agency head, governor, or areawide planning district administrator, their submission and publication still would serve to enhance public accountability and facilitate interlevel and interagency planning coordination.

Accountability

The vagueness of most of the special revenue sharing bills with regard to the contents of annual comprehensive plans or program statements and their inconsistency in terms of the jurisdictional and interagency framework for the planning process, raise questions as to the means through which accountability can be effectively enforced. In general, the proposals would call on the States to plan a leadership role in integrating program planning. Although the States would not be assigned specifically a veto power over local efforts under the legislation, in all of the bills except Urban Community Development and Manpower, they would in effect be placed in this position by virtue of their responsibilities for approving local and areawide plan submission procedures and developing a statewide plan.

With respect to Federal-State relationships, each special revenue sharing proposal would authorize the Federal agency head to require the submission of annual reports concerning the status of funds disbursed and program objective achievements. These documents would be published and made accessible for public scrutiny. A less formal approach to ensuring accountability contained in all the bills would be the mandatory exchange of comments and recommendations regarding plans and program statements among Federal, State, and local officials.

To Sum Up

From the planning and administrative standpoints, the Administration's six special revenue sharing proposals would

appear to be attempting to strike a very delicate balance between the "no strings" tenet of this new approach and the more directive role typically played by Federal agencies administering categorical aid programs. Attaining a workable balance will be quite difficult, as can be seen in the varying ways in which the bills confront the organizational and accountability dimensions of State and substate planning and programming. While, in general, the proposals clearly reveal Federal priorities in certain areas — such as the need to encourage areawide planning, the desirability of the "single State agency" approach, and the key coordinative role of the State and particularly the governor — other important matters are not covered. These include issues involving the relationships between the State general planning agency and organizational units set up to handle special revenue sharing planning; between ongoing functional planning and special revenue sharing plans and program statements; and between programs not folded into special revenue sharing and State and local planning efforts.

Appendix A

SOURCES OF SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING FUNDS

RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

- Extension Service — Extension programs for assisting in community development
- Extension Service — Extension programs for forestry production and marketing
- Extension Service — Extension programs for improved family living
- Extension Service — Extension programs for improved nutrition
- Extension Service — Extension programs for improved farm income
- Extension Service — Extension programs for marketing and distribution
- Extension Service — Extension programs for pesticides safety and rural civil defense
- Extension Service — Extension programs for recreation, wildlife, and natural beauty
- Extension Service — Extension programs for soil and water conservation
- Extension Service — 4-H youth development programs
- Rural Environmental Assistance (formerly Agri. Conservation Program)

- Rural Water and Waste Disposal Facilities
- Forest Service Grants for Forestry Assistance—State and private forestry cooperation
- Great Plains Conservation Program
- Water Bank Program
- Resource Conservation and Development Program
- Tree Planting Assistance—State and private forestry cooperation
- Regional development programs—Coastal Plains Reg. Comm.
- Regional development programs—Four Corners Reg. Comm.
- Regional development programs—New England Reg. Comm.
- Regional development programs—Ozarks Regional Comm.
- Eco. Dev.—Development facilities (Public Works) Grants
- Eco. Dev.—Development facilities (Public Works) Loans
- Eco. Dev.—Industrial development—Loans
- Eco. Dev.—Planning assistance
- Eco. Dev.—Technical assistance
- Eco. Dev.—Operations and administration
- Eco. Dev.—Miscellaneous expired accounts
- Eco. Dev.—Economic development revolving fund
- Appalachian Reg. Comm.—Supplements to Federal grant-in-aid
- Appalachian Reg. Comm.—Development highway system

Appalachian Reg. Comm.—Health demonstrations
 Appalachian Reg. Comm.—Land stabilization, conservation and erosion control
 Appalachian Reg. Comm.—Local access roads
 Appalachian Reg. Comm.—Local development district assistance
 Appalachian Reg. Comm.—Mine area restoration
 Appalachian Reg. Comm.—State research, technical assistance—demonstration
 Appalachian Reg. Comm.—Vocational education facilities
 Appalachian Reg. Comm.—Salaries and Expenses

URBAN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Urban Renewal—Projects
 Urban Renewal—Neighborhood development
 Urban Renewal—Certified areas
 Urban Renewal—Code enforcement grants
 Urban Renewal—Rehabilitation grants
 Urban Renewal—Community renewal planning grants
 Urban Renewal—Demolition grants
 Urban Renewal—Interim assistance for blighted areas grants
 Model cities—Supplementary grants
 Community development
 Grants for basic sewer and water facilities
 Rehabilitation loans

EDUCATION

El. and Sec. Ed.—Educationally deprived children:
 —Local educational agencies
 —Handicapped
 —Migrants
 —State administration
 —In institutions for neglected or delinquent children
 —Incentive grants (new)
 —Grants for concentration of disadvantaged children (new)
 —Grants to BIA for Indian schools

El. and Sec. Ed.—Supplementary services:
 —Guidance, counseling, and testing
 —Nonpublic school testing
 —Supplementary education services and centers

El. and Sec. Ed.—Library resources:
 —School library resources, textbooks, and others
 —Instructional materials

El. and Sec. Ed.—Equipment and minor remodeling:
 —School equipment grants to nonprofit private schools
 —Strengthening instruction through equipment and minor remodeling

El. and Sec. Ed.—Strengthening State Depts. of Education:
 —Strengthening school administration training grants
 —Strengthening State Depts. of education:
 —grants for special projects
 —grants to States

El. and Sec. Ed.—School assistance in federally affected areas:
 —Maintenance and operation
 —Construction
 —Public housing (new)

El. and Sec. Ed.—Education of the handicapped:
 —Handicapped pre-school and school programs

El. and Sec. Ed.—Vocational and adult education:
 —Basic grants to States
 —Consumer and homemaking
 —Cooperative education
 —Special needs
 —State advisory councils
 —Work study
 —Research—50 percent
 —Innovation

El. and Sec. Ed.—Department of Agriculture—Food and Nutrition Services—Child Nutrition Programs:
 —School lunch assistance
 —Non-food assistance
 —State administrative expenses

MANPOWER TRAINING

Manpower training services—Apprenticeship outreach
 Manpower training services—Concentrated employment program
 Manpower training services—Cooperative area manpower planning system
 Manpower training services—Job banks
 Manpower training services—Job corps
 Manpower training services—Job opportunities in business sector
 Manpower training services—Journeyman training
 Manpower training services—MDTA institutional training
 Manpower training services—Manpower E&D projects
 Manpower training services—Manpower research, doctoral dissertation grants
 Manpower training services—Manpower research—institutional grants
 Manpower training services—Manpower research and evaluation
 Manpower training services—Manpower research project grants
 Manpower training services—Neighborhood youth corps
 Manpower training services—Operation Mainstream
 Manpower training services—Public service careers
 Manpower training services—JOBS—low support

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration:
 Grants for improving and strengthening law enforcement
 Discretionary grants

TRANSPORTATION

UMTA—Urban mass transportation fund:
 —Capital grants
 —Technical studies
 —University research and training
 FAA—Grants-in-aid for airports (general fund)
 FAA—Grants-in-aid for airports (trust fund):
 —Planning grants
 —Air carrier airport
 —General aviation grants
 FHWA—Federal aid highways (trust fund):
 (Excludes Interstate system, interstate portion of grants for planning and research and the Interstate portion of Admin. research and bridges over dams)
 —Primary highways
 —Secondary highways
 —Urban extension highways
 —Urban systems
 —TOPICS (traffic operations in urban areas)
 —Rural primary (special)
 —Rural secondary (special)
 —Emergency relief
 —Economic growth center highways
 —Bridge replacement
 —Highway safety grants
 —Planning and research grants and administration
 FHWA—Highway Beautification (general fund):
 —Outdoor advertising control
 —Junkyard and control
 —Landscaping scenic enhancement
 —Administrative expenses
 FHWA—Highway related safety grants
 NHTSA—State and community highway safety (general fund)
 NHTSA—Highway safety program—grants portion only (trust fund)

Source: The Domestic Council, Executive Office of the President, *Highlights of Revenue Sharing—Reform Renewal for the 70's* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office) pp. 8 and 9.

Appendix B

Law Enforcement Assistance: Proposed Conversion of a Block Grant to Special Revenue Sharing

Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 established the Federal government's first comprehensive grant-in-aid program for assisting State and local crime reduction efforts. This legislation was a marked departure from most other grants enacted by Congress in the 1960's. It embodied a block grant approach, instead of following in the "categorical" aid tradition of narrow-purpose, project-oriented grants which maximized the authority and preferences of Federal administrators and often bypassed the States. The Act dealt with the broad area of law enforcement and criminal justice administration, minimized the role of Congress and Federal agencies in setting priorities, and accorded the States major responsibility for planning, administering, and coordinating anti-crime programs.*

* See Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, *Making the Safe Streets Act Work: An Intergovernmental Challenge* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970).

In his March 2, 1971 message to Congress proposing special revenue sharing for law enforcement, however, President Nixon indicated certain shortcomings of the existing block grant device. He specifically advocated special revenue sharing as a way to "...strengthen and increase its effectiveness in the war on crime by increasing both the resources of State and local enforcement and judicial agencies, as well as their freedom to use the resources at their disposal."* Law enforcement assistance, then, underscores the fact that the differences between block grants and special revenue sharing are more than merely semantic.

As the President noted in his special message, the block grant program administered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) of the Department of Justice already contains certain components of the five other special revenue sharing measures. Under the 1968 legislation, for example, States are required to prepare a comprehensive plan for criminal justice reform as a condition for receiving Federal "action" funds. At the same time, the Act mandates the creation of broadly representative State level planning agencies (SPA's) to prepare such statewide plans, approve project applications, award grants, coordinate interfunctional and intergovernmental crime reduction activities, and monitor the use of Federal funds by recipient agencies. Fiscally, the Safe Streets Act provides for the automatic distribution of funds in accordance with a formula based on each State's population. Also, like the special revenue sharing proposals, the Act sets aside a specific proportion of the annual appropriation — 15% — for grants to be awarded at LEAA's discretion for stimulating innovative approaches to dealing with crime problems, advancing national priorities, meeting pressing State and local needs, and other special emphasis purposes.

Special revenue sharing for law enforcement would go several steps beyond the block grant features of the 1968 Act and its 1970 amendments. A major difference would be the elimination of matching requirements for all action programs. The present matching ratios — 75-25 for non-construction programs and 50-50 for construction projects — reflect the efforts of Congress in 1970 to limit the range of variable matching under the original Act — 75-25 for riot and civil disorders control projects, 60-40 for "action" programs, and 50-50 for construction. The objective was to reduce the "skewing" effects of such ratios on State and local

* *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*, March 8, 1971, p. 413.

budgets and priorities, as well as to make it easier for these jurisdictions to come up with sufficient matching money to enable them to participate in various anti-crime efforts.

Special revenue sharing, however, would not eliminate the 90-10 matching requirements for law enforcement and criminal justice planning grants under the Safe Streets Act, nor would it alter the 75-25 match necessary for State and local governments to obtain funds earmarked for correctional institutions and facilities. The latter is, in effect, a separate program authorized by Congress last year to give iron-clad assurance that adequate attention would be directed to meeting the critical needs of corrections. The fiscal obstacles inherent in retention of these matching requirements would be overcome through authorizing the use of special revenue sharing dollars to cover the non-Federal share of grants for planning and corrections purposes. The President's proposal also would repeal the 1970 "buy in" amendment, which provides that in order for States to receive block grant awards they must make a 25 per cent contribution to the non-Federal share of local action programs.

A second significant difference between block grants and special revenue sharing is the changed nature of Federal-State relationships in the planning process. Under the present Safe Streets Act, the States submit comprehensive law enforcement plans which must be approved by LEAA prior to the awarding of the States' share of block grants. Often, LEAA approves a plan but attaches "special conditions" to it which must be met if the State is to continue receiving crime control funds. The Act also specifies in detail the proper contents of a comprehensive plan.

Special revenue sharing, on the other hand, would restrict LEAA's role to reviewing, commenting, and making recommendations on statewide plans. It would replace specific programmatic, administrative, fiscal, interagency, and accountability guideposts with a very general statement of what constitutes a "comprehensive" plan - "... consider statewide priorities for the improvement and coordination of all aspects of law enforcement, the general types of improvements to be made in the future, the effective utilization of existing facilities, the encouragement of cooperative arrangements between units of general local government, and innovations and advanced techniques." Although in practice comments and recommendations by a Federal agency dispensing substantial amounts of financial assistance often have the force of mandates, and vagueness can be used to advantage by Federal as well as non-Federal officials, nevertheless on paper

LEAA's current clout vis-a-vis the States in particular would be substantially erased. Interestingly, perhaps in an effort to highlight the semi-categorical nature of the recent corrections title of the Act, the Administration's special revenue sharing bill would amend the section dealing with comprehensive planning by adding to it identical detailed provisions contained in the existing action grant title. These deal with corrections plan contents, cooperative arrangements, research and development, review of SPA actions harmful to local applicants, willingness of State and localities to assume costs of improvements, State technical assistance, and supplanting of expenditures.

Like other special revenue sharing measures, under the Law Enforcement proposal Congress would retain some of its influence over the flow and use of Federal dollars. For example, the present mandatory overall "pass through" of 75 per cent of Federal action funds and 40 per cent of planning funds from State to locality would be kept, as would the Act's so called "flexible pass through," which, beginning July 1, 1972, would award action funds to local jurisdictions in accordance with a formula based on State and local law enforcement expenditures during the immediately preceding fiscal year. Second, statutory provisions would be retained requiring that State comprehensive plans allocate an adequate share of funds to areas with a high incidence of crime and high law enforcement activity, that priority be given to organized crime and riot and civil disorder control programs, and that State planning agencies assure their major counties and cities will receive funds to prepare comprehensive plans and coordinate anti-crime efforts at the local level. Although under the proposed legislation LEAA would be divested of its plan approval role, still plans would be statutorily mandated to give such preferences and assurances as a condition for receipt of special revenue sharing payments. Third, the subsection of the Safe Streets Act prohibiting the expenditure of not more than one-third of any action grant for personnel compensation would remain undisturbed by special revenue sharing.

To sum up, the sharp contrasts between special revenue sharing for law enforcement and the block grant program established by the Safe Streets Act — the best example of a true block grant program enacted by Congress to date — indicate that there are very real differences between the two funding approaches. If the various types of Federal financial assistance were ranked on a progressive scale from least to most flexibility in

fiscal, programmatic, and accountability matters, the order would be as follows:

LEAST

MOST

categorical grants → block grants → special revenue sharing → general revenue sharing

Finally, a note of caution should be sounded concerning the outlook for law enforcement special revenue sharing. At a time when the Nixon Administration is proposing to give the States greater discretion in statewide planning and programming and the Federal Government lesser oversight and approval responsibilities, some observers are advocating the opposite strategy. Recent statements by big city officials and the July and October 1971 hearings before the House Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs on State abuses of LEAA funds, for example, suggest that many of the critical questions regarding the nature of Federal-State relationships in law enforcement assistance which have persisted since the inception of the program are still far from settled.

Appendix C

Appendix C--Selected Features of Special Revenue Sharing Programs

Program	Purposes of Grant	Eligible Recipients	Allocation Formula
Education	<p>To assist State and local school systems meet their elementary and secondary education needs, to encourage innovation and development of new educational programs and practices, to provide for educationally disadvantaged children an education comparable to that available to their classmates, to provide the special educational services needed by the physically and mentally handicapped, to encourage greater attention to vocational and career education, to assure to children whose parents live or work on Federal property an education comparable to that given to other children, and to provide State and local educational officials with the flexibility and responsibility they need to make meaningful decisions in response to the needs of their students.</p>	<p>State governments and local school systems. Funds also to be made available to non-public schools either by the State or directly by the Sec. of H.E.W. (where State law precludes the State from providing financial support to such schools.)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. 10% of the amount appropriated may be reserved by the Sec. of H.E.W. for special grants to the States, at his discretion. Remainder allocated as follows:2. 60% of the average per pupil expenditure in the U.S. multiplied by the number of children in average daily attendance (ADA) in the State who reside on Federal property ("Impact A"). State is required to pass funds on to local school systems in proportion to number of "Impact A" children. Funds to be used for "any educational purpose."3. The remainder allocated in proportion to the sum of the ratios obtained by computing each State's share of the U.S. total for each of the following:<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. Total number of children, aged 5-17, in low-income families (as defined by the Sec. of H.E.W.). Except for amount retained by the State for education of neglected or delinquent children in State institutions, State is required to pass funds allotted on this basis on to local school systems in proportion to number of children aged 5-17, in

Appendix C--Selected Features of Special Revenue Sharing Programs (Cont'd.)

Program Education (cont'd.)	Purposes of Grant	Eligible Recipients	Allocation Formula
			low-income families. Funds to be used only to meet special educational needs of educationally disadvantaged children, including those of migratory agricultural workers.
			b. 60% of number of children in ADA residing on non-Federal property with parent employed on Federal property or with a parent on active military duty ("Impact B"). Up to 30% of the amount allotted on this basis may be paid to school systems without such children (remainder to be paid to school districts with "Impact B" children in proportion to number of such children). Funds to be used for "any educational purpose."
			c. 10% of the total number of children aged 5-17. To be distributed to State institutions and local school systems for use as follows: (1) 1/6 to meet special educational needs of handicapped children, (2) 1/3 for vocational education, and (3) 1/2 for supporting materials and services (e.g., textbooks, library resources, meals, supplementary

Appendix C--Selected Features of Special Revenue Sharing Programs (Cont'd.)

Program	Purposes of Grant	Eligible Recipients	Allocation Formula
Education (concl'd.)			educational services, etc.). Up to 30% of the amounts allocated under (1), (2), and (3) may be used for any of the other purposes authorized under the program (e.g., educationally disadvantaged; Impact A or B).
Transportation	To assist State and local government develop, operate and maintain transportation systems, facilities and equipment capable of providing for the fast, safe, convenient and efficient movement of persons and goods, as determined in accord with State and local priorities and consistent with community development plans and programs.	States, units of local general government (counties, cities, towns, townships and villages) and consortia of such local governments.	<p>Mass Transportation:</p> <p>Of the amount authorized to be obligated for mass transportation purposes (\$263 million for FY 1972 and \$635 million each for FY's 1973, 1974 and 1975):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 80% to States with metropolitan areas with population of 1 million or more, in proportion to population of such areas, half of which is required to be passed on to the units of local governments in such metropolitan areas, in proportion to population. The other half may be used by the State for mass transportation activities in or benefiting such metropolitan areas. 2. 20% to States with metropolitan areas with populations of 50,000 to 999,999, in proportion to population, to be used by the State for mass transportation activities in or

Appendix C--Selected Features of Special Revenue Sharing Programs (Cont'd.)

Program	Purposes of Grant	Eligible Recipients	Allocation Formula
Transportation (cont'd.)			<p>benefiting urban places (as defined by the Bureau of the Census). There is a minimum allocation of \$250 thousand per State.</p> <p>Highways and Airports:</p> <p>Of the remainder authorized to be obligated (\$1,022 million for FY 1972 and \$2,165 million each for FY's 1973, 1974 and 1975):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 10% to the Sec. of D.O.T. to be used at his discretion, including an increase of 10% in the amounts to be distributed by the State for mass transportation to local governments in metropolitan areas of 1 million or more and for highways and airports to urban places in any metropolitan areas where such local governments form consortia. 2. 90% as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. 35% in proportion to population of urban places (over 2,500 population), to be distributed by the State to such places in proportion to population. b. 25% in proportion to total population. c. 20% in proportion to area.

Appendix C--Selected Features of Special Revenue Sharing Programs (Cont'd.)

Programs	Purposes of Grant	Eligible Recipients	Allocation Formula
Transportation (concl'd.)			<p>d. 20% in proportion to mileage of rural delivery routes, star routes.</p> <p>The allocations under b, c and d, above, to be used by the State for "transportation activities" (including mass transportation).</p>
Urban Community Development	<p>To assist local governments improve public services, eliminate and prevent urban blight, provide low and moderate income housing, develop properly planned community facilities and public improvements, conserve and enhance the natural and urban environment, provide adequate recreational opportunities, and the like.</p>	<p>Units of local general government in metropolitan areas (including consortia of such local governments) and (at the discretion of the Sec. of HUD) States.</p>	<p>1. Up to 20% to the Sec. of HUD, to be used at his discretion, including (with amounts appropriated for the purpose) grants to cities with populations of less than 50,000 and to States.</p> <p>2. At least 80% distributed:</p> <p>a. To central cities and other cities in metropolitan areas with population of 50,000 or more (metropolitan cities) in proportion to the following factors (initial allocation is to metropolitan areas on the same basis):</p> <p>(1) Population,</p> <p>(2) Persons or families with incomes below poverty level (amount of poverty),</p> <p>(3) Housing units with 1.01 persons or more per room (amount of overcrowding), and</p>

Appendix C--Selected Features of Special Revenue Sharing Programs (Cont'd.)

Program	Purposes of Grant	Eligible Recipients	Allocation Formula
Urban Community Development (concl'd.)			<p>(4) Housing units lacking some or all plumbing facilities (extent of housing deficiencies).</p> <p>b. Remainder of amount allotted to metropolitan area distributed by the Sec. of HUD, to all other units of general local government, taking into account population, amount of poverty, amount of overcrowding, extent of housing deficiencies, and other social and fiscal conditions prevailing in the metropolitan area.</p>
Manpower Training	<p>To assist State and local governments provide such combination of manpower services, institutional training, on-the-job training, supported employment, and ancillary services needed by unemployed and underemployed persons to prepare for, secure and hold self-sustaining public and private employment.</p>	<p>States, units of local general government with population of 100,000 and over, and consortia of smaller units of local general government.</p>	<p>1. 15% to Sec. of Labor for use in manpower activities, including the provision of technical assistance to States and localities in establishing and conducting manpower programs.</p> <p>2. 85% to eligible State and local governments in proportion to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Number in labor force. Number of unemployed; and Number of low-income individuals 18 years or older.

Appendix C--Selected Features of Special Revenue Sharing Programs (Cont'd.)

Program	Purposes of Grant	Eligible Recipients	Allocation Formula
Manpower Training (concl'd.)			The amount distributed to a consortium of local governments that includes one unit of 100,000 population or more and constitutes a defined labor market area is increased by 10 percent.
Rural Community Development	To assist the States in conducting activities to generate increased employment opportunities and individual incomes in rural areas, to improve the quality and accessibility of rural community facilities and services, to stem out-migration from rural areas, to encourage private investment in industrial, agricultural, and commercial enterprises, to solve farm, home, and community problems, to protect and conserve natural resources, and to establish and improve public works and development facilities. States are required to maintain a program of	States	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Up to 20% to Sec. of Agriculture to be used at his discretion. 2. At least 80% distributed: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. 1% divided equally among the States. b. Of the remainder: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) 50% in proportion to rural population, (2) 25% in inverse proportion to rural per capita income, and (3) 25% in inverse proportion to the percentage change in rural population

Appendix C--Selected Features of Special Revenue Sharing Programs (Concl'd.)

Program	Purposes of Grant	Eligible Recipients	Allocation Formula
Rural Community Development (concl'd.)	agricultural extension work comparable in size and type to the agricultural extension program carried out in fiscal 1971.	States and units of local general government.	1. 15% to Law Enforcement Administration to be used at its discretion to make grants to State and local governments. 2. 85% to States in proportion to population. States to pass 75% of their share to units of local general government on the basis of combinations of such units on the basis of project applications in accordance with the State plan. In subsequent years (after July 1, 1972) State payments to local governments are to be made in proportion to the local governments' share of State-local expenditure for law enforcement in the prior year.
Law Enforcement	To assist State and local governments strengthen and improve law enforcement at every level.	States and units of local general government.	

Source: ACIR staff compilation.

Appendix D

Appendix D—Matching Requirements and Allocation Formulas of Major Categorical Grants Covered into Special Revenue Sharing Programs

Program	Matching requirements	Allocation formula	Obligations, FY 1971 (Est.) (millions)
<u>Education</u>			
Ed. Deprived Children—Local Educational Agencies	None	No. of children aged 5-17 (1) in families with less than \$3,000 annual income, (2) in families receiving more than \$3,000 annual income under the aid to families with dependent children program or (3) living in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, multiplied by 1/2 the average per pupil expenditure in the State or in the U.S., whichever is greater	\$1,340.0
Ed. Deprived Children—Handicapped	None	No. of handicapped children in average daily attendance, multiplied by 1/2 the average per pupil expenditure in the State or in the U.S., whichever is greater	46.1
Ed. Deprived Children—Migrants	None	No. of migrant children, aged 5-17 multiplied by 1/2 the average per pupil expenditure in the U.S.	57.6
Supplementary Educational Centers and Services, Guidance, Counseling and Testing	None	(1) \$200,000 to each State (2) Of the remainder, 1/2 in proportion to no. of children aged 5-17, and 1/2 in proportion to total resident population	123.6

**Appendix D—Matching Requirements and Allocation Formulas of Major
Categorical Grants Covered into Special Revenue Sharing Programs (Cont'd.)**

Program	Matching requirements	Allocation formula	Obligations, FY 1971 (Est.) (millions)
Education (cont'd.)			
School Library Resources, Textbooks and other Instructional Materials	50% Federal 50% State	No. of children enrolled in public and private elementary and secondary schools	\$ 80.0
Strengthening Instruction through Equipment and Minor Remodeling	50% Federal 50% State	No. of children aged 5-17 multiplied by a fiscal capacity factor based on the relation- ship between State personal income per school age child and U.S. personal income per school age child	49.5
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas (Impact Aid)— Maintenance and Operation	None	No. of children in average daily attendance living on Federal property with a parent working on Federal property plus 1/2 the number of children in average daily attendance residing outside of Federal property with a parent working on Federal property multi- plied by the "local contribution rate," which is the average current expenditure from local revenue sources per pupil in average daily attendance for comparable school districts in the State	501.5
Handicapped preschool and school programs	None	Population aged 3-21	34.0

Appendix D—Matching Requirements and Allocation Formulas of Major Categorical Grants Covered into Special Revenue Sharing Programs (Cont'd.)			
Program	Matching requirements	Allocation formula	Obligations, FY 1971 (Est.) (millions)
<u>Education (concl'd.)</u>			
Vocational Education—Basic Grants to States	50% Federal 50% State	50% in proportion to population aged 15-19; 20% in proportion to population aged 20-24; 15% in proportion to population aged 25-65; each multiplied by a fiscal capacity factor based on the relationship between State per capita income and U.S. per capita income. The remaining 15% is allocated in the proportion to the amount allotted under the above-described computation	\$321.7
School Lunch Assistance (part)	25% Federal 75% State, but State share is reduced by the percentage that its per capita income falls below the national average	In proportion to the "participation rate" multiplied by the "assistance need rate." The "participation rate" is the number of lunches meeting minimum requirements served by participating school during the previous fiscal year. The "assistance need rate" is a factor ranging from 5 to 9 depending on the State's per capita income relative to the U.S. average	171.0
<u>Transportation</u>			
Urban Mass Transit (UMT)—Capital Grants	2/3 Federal 1/3 State or local (Relocation costs 100% Federal)	At discretion of the Secretary of DOT on the basis of project applications, but grants in any one State may not exceed 12 1/2% of the funds available (or 15% under special circumstances)	284.7

**Appendix D—Matching Requirements and Allocation Formulas of Major
Categorical Grants Covered into Special Revenue Sharing Programs (Cont'd.)**

Program	Matching requirements	Allocation formula	Obligations, FY 1971 (Est.) (millions)
<u>Transportation (cont'd.)</u>			
UMT Technical Studies	Ditto	At discretion of the Secretary of DOT on the basis of project applications	\$ 15.0
Federal Aid Highways (excludes interstate)	50% Federal 50% State	For primary system: 1/3 in proportion to area, 1/3 in proportion to total population, 1/3 in proportion to mileage of rural delivery and star routes For secondary system: 1/3 in proportion to area, 1/3 in proportion to rural population, 1/3 in proportion to mileage of rural delivery and star routes For extensions in urban areas: In proportion to population in municipalities and other urban places with 5,000 or more inhabitants In proportion to population in municipalities and other urban places with 5,000 or more inhabitants	1,412.0
Traffic Operations in Urban Areas (TOPICS)	Ditto		
Highway Safety	Ditto	3/4 in proportion to population, 1/4 in proportion to road mileage	71.9

Appendix D—Matching Requirements and Allocation Formulas of Major Categorical Grants Covered into Special Revenue Sharing Programs (Cont'd.)			
Program	Matching requirements	Allocation formula	Obligations, FY 1971 (Est.) (millions)
<u>Transportation (concl'd.)</u>			
Airport Development	50% Federal 50% State or local	For air-carrier airports: 1/3 in proportion to population, 1/3 in proportion to no. of passengers, and 1/3 at discretion of Sec. of DOT For general aviation airports: 3/4 in proportion to population, and 1/4 at discretion of Sec. of DOT	\$ 270.0
Airport Planning	2/3 Federal 1/3 State or local	At discretion of the Sec. of DOT on basis of project applications	10.0
<u>Urban Community Development</u>			
Urban Renewal—Projects	2/3 or 3/4 Federal, 1/3 or 1/4 Local, depending upon size of community	At discretion of the Sec. of HUD, on the basis of project applications but not more than 12 1/2% of the available funds may be spent in any one State	589.0
Urban Renewal Neighborhood Development	Ditto	Ditto	361.0
Urban Renewal—Rehabilitation Grants	None	At discretion of the Sec. of HUD on basis of applications from private individuals (owners and tenants)	37.8

**Appendix D—Matching Requirements and Allocation Formulas of Major
Categorical Grants Covered into Special Revenue Sharing Programs (Cont'd.)**

Program	Matching requirements (concl'd.)	Allocation formula	Obligations, FY 1971 (Est.) (millions)
Urban Community Development (concl'd.)			
Urban Renewal— Rehabilitation Loans	None	Ditto	\$ 50.0
Model Cities Supplemental Grants	80% Federal 20% Local	At discretion of the Sec. of HUD on basis of project applications	504.2
Basic Sewer and Water Facilities	50% Federal 50% Local	Ditto	150.0
Manpower Training			
MDTA Institutional Training	90% Federal 10% State, in cash or in kind	80% of funds to be apportioned, taking into account (1) the no. in the labor force, (2) the no. of unemployed, (3) lack of appropriate full- time employment, (4) insured unemployed as % of insured employed, (5) average weekly un- employment compensation benefits paid by the State. The other 20% to be expended at the discretion of the Secs. of Labor and HEW	327.6
Neighborhood Youth Corps	90% Federal 10% State and local governments or private nonprofit organizations, in cash or in kind	Apportionment to take into account, among other relevant factors, the ratios of population, unemployment and family income levels. Not more than 12 1/2% of the funds are to be paid in any one State	351.8

**Appendix D—Matching Requirements and Allocation Formulas of Major
Categorical Grants Covered Into Special Revenue Sharing Programs (Cont'd.)**

Program	Matching requirements	Allocation formula	Obligations, FY 1971 (Est.) (millions)
<u>Manpower Training (concl'd.)</u>			
Operation Mainstream	Ditto	Ditto	\$ 38.8
Public Service Careers	None	At discretion of Regional Manpower Administrators on the basis of project applications	126.8
Concentrated Employment Program	Federal 90% Local 10%	At discretion of the Director of the Manpower Administration on the basis of project applications	177.9
<u>Rural Community Development</u>			
Agricultural Extension (10 programs)	50% Federal 50% State	20%—equal shares 40%—rural population 40%—farm population	138.0
Rural Environmental Assistance ¹	50% Federal 50% Agricultural Producer	None (reimbursement or provision of materials and services in lieu of payments)	150.0
Rural Water and Waste Disposal Facilities (grants only)	50% Federal 50% Public or quasi-public agencies	None (at discretion of Sec. of Agriculture on basis of project applications)	40.0

¹ Direct aid from Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, USDA, to agricultural producers (not to State or local governments).

**Appendix D—Matching Requirements and Allocation Formulas of Major
Categorical Grants Covered into Special Revenue Sharing Programs (Cont'd.)**

Program	Matching requirements	Allocation formula	Obligations, FY 1971 (Est.) (millions)
<u>Rural Community Development (cont'd.)</u>			
State and Private Forestry Cooperation	50% Federal 50% State, local or private woodland owners and forestry industries	Need, performance and project applications	\$ 27.7
Economic Development Administration (EDA)— Grants for Public Works and Development Facilities	50% Federal 50% State and local governments or private and public nonprofit organization	None (at discretion of Administrator on basis of project applications)	160.0
EDA—Loans for Public Works and Development Facilities	Ditto	Ditto	14.0
EDA—Industrial Development Loans	65% Federal 35% Individual and private or public cor- porations including commercial lenders	None (at discretion of Administrator on basis of project applications)	46.0
Appalachian Regional Com- mission (ARC)—Supplements to Federal Grants-in-Aid	80% Federal 20% State	None (at discretion of Commission on basis of projects in designated counties making up the Appalachian Region)	44.5

Table 3-1

Number and Percent of Recorded Critical Incident Observations Referring to Administrative Variable Items by Students and Professionals in the Decatur City School System

Item Number	Student Observed		Student Not Observed		Professional Observed		Professional Not Observed	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
41					7	13	47	87
1	43	12	305	85	13	23	44	77
12	74	21	277	78	4	7	53	93
33					1	2	53	98
42					1	2	53	98
43					18	33	37	67
25					5	9	49	91

the year to effect needed remodeling and repairs of the school building," were as follows; professional observed 7 responding for 13%, professional not observed 47 responding for 87%.

Professional responses to item 1, "The completion of necessary remodeling and repairs of the school has disrupted school activities," were as follows; professional observed 13 reporting for 23%, professional not observed 44 responding for 77%. Student responses to item 1 were 43 responding for 12% on student observed and 305 responding for 85% on student not observed.

Professional responses to item 12, "Individuals have been brought in to teach special courses on a part-time basis," were as follows; professional observed 4 responding for 7%, professional not observed 53 reporting for 93%. Student responses to item 12 were 74 responding for 21% on student observed and 277 responding for 78% on student not observed.

Professional responses to item 33, "The quarter system has provided increased state financing," were as follows; professional observed 1 responding for 2%, professional not observed 53 responding for 98%.

Social Implications

Seventy-three students or 20% of those who responded marked "observed" for item 9, and none of the teachers who responded marked "observed".

To item 15, 27 students or 8% had observed and none of the teachers had observed.

Item 23 drew a response of "observed" from 219 students or 61% and 19 teachers or 34%. Only 9% of the students who responded to item 23 had observed, and none of the teachers who responded had observed.

Only the teachers responded to item 37, and only 8% or 4 teachers marked "observed".

Professional Enhancement

In response to item 5, 211 students or 59% of those who responded and 41 teachers or 72% of those who responded had observed that students had received help from subject area teachers in choosing courses.

Only 14 teachers, 25% of those who responded to item 27, observed that the quarter system had allowed for effective utilization of teachers' special abilities.

Twenty-three teachers or 40% of those who responded to item 28 marked "observed".

Only 6 teachers or 11% of those who responded to item 30 had observed that teachers had taken different quarters off for professional improvement.

Thirty teachers or 54% who responded to item 35, observed that teachers had been assigned to courses that they most like to teach; and to item 36 only 17 teachers or 30% of those who responded observed in-service meetings were difficult to schedule in the limited

Table 3-2

Number and Percent of Recorded Critical Incident Observations Referring to Social Implication Items by Students and Professionals in the Decatur City School System

Item Number	Student Observed		Student Not Observed		Professional Observed		Professional Not Observed	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
22	219	61	130	36	19	34	37	66
9	73	20	276	77	0	0	55	100
23	32	9	317	89	0	0	57	100
15	27	8	322	90	0	0	55	100
5								
37					4	8	49	92

time between quarters.

Fifteen teachers or 40% of those who responded to item 40 observed that teachers have been employed for a full calendar year.

In the totals for the entire area of professional enhancement, 146 teachers or 35% marked "observed" and 250 teachers or 65% marked "not observed".

Program Flexibility

Sixty-two percent of the students and 63% of the teachers in Decatur High School who responded to item 7 had observed that courses had been offered to students who need special help in a subject.

Of those who responded to item 10, "Enrichment courses have allowed students to pursue special interests, 203 students or 57% and 30 teachers or 53% marked "observed".

Item 11 concerns work experience of the students and teachers who responded, 150 students or 42% and 14 teachers or 25% had observed that work experience through cooperative programs had been provided.

Forty-seven percent of the students who responded to item 16 responded that they had observed that individual programs were designed from a wide variety of courses. Only 31 teachers or 54% of those who responded had observed this.

Fewer students indicated that they had observed that programs had been tailored for individual students. Only 112 students or 31% of those who responded had observed this, but 26 teachers or 46% of those who responded had observed it.

Scheduling Flexibility

On Item 20, "Courses failed have been made up in the summer quarter," 29 professional observations were recorded. Twenty-six professionals responded negatively.

Student responses to item 20 were 285 responding for 80% on student observed and 65 responding for 18% on student not observed. Professional responses to item 13, "Courses failed have been made up during the following year", were as follows; professional observed 43 responding for 77%; professional not observed 13 responding for 23%. Student responses to item 13 were 266 responding for 75% on student observed and 85 responding for 24% on student not observed.

Professional responses to item 21, "Students have made up failures in each quarter of the year," were as follows; professional observed 19 responding for 35%, professional not observed 35 responding for 65%. Student responses to item 21 were 131 responding for 34% on student observed and 218 responding for 61% on student not observed.

Professional responses to item 24, "Students take courses any quarter and in any order," were as follows; professional observed 2 responding for 4%, professional not observed 55 responding for 96%.

Table 3-3

Number and Percent of Recorded Critical Incident Observations Referring to Professional Enhancement Items by Students and Professionals in the Decatur City School System

Item Number	Student Observed		Student Not Observed		Professional Observed		Professional Not Observed	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
28					23	40	34	60
30					6	11	50	89
40					15	27	42	73
36					17	30	39	70
27					14	25	43	75
35					30	54	26	46
5	211	59	143	40	41	72	16	28

Table 3-4

Number and Percent of Recorded Critical Incident Observations Referring to Program Flexibility Items by Students and Professionals in the Decatur City School System

Item Number	Student Observed		Student Not Observed		Professional Observed		Professional Not Observed	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
16	167	47	181	51	31	54	26	46
7	221	62	127	35	36	63	21	37
10	203	57	147	41	30	53	27	47
17	112	31	234	66	26	46	31	54
11	150	42	199	56	14	25	42	75

Table 3-5

Number and Percent of Recorded Critical Incident Observations Referring to Scheduling Flexibility Items by Students and Professionals in the Decatur City School System

Item Number	Student Observed		Student Not Observed		Professional Observed		Professional Not Observed	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
20	285	80	65	18	29	53	26	47
13	266	75	85	24	43	77	13	23
21	131	37	218	61	19	35	35	65
24	41	11	308	86	2	4	55	96
14	55	15	296	83	1	2	55	98
2	64	18	290	81	6	11	51	89
38					21	37	35	63
6	83	23	269	75	1	2	51	98
29					1	2	51	98
8	53	15	298	83	2	4	55	96
19	65	18	280	78	1	2	56	98

Student responses to item 24 were 41 responding for 11% on student observed and 308 responding for 86% on student not observed.

Professional responses to item 14, "Students take most courses any quarter and in any order," were as follows; professional observed 1 responding for 2% professional not observed 55 responding for 98%. Student responses to item 24 were 41 responding for 11% on student observed and 308 responding for 86% on student not observed.

Professional responses to item 14, "Students take most courses any quarter and in any order," were as follows; professional observed 1 responding for 2% professional not observed 55 responding for 98%. Student responses to item 14 were 55 responding for 14% on student observed and 296 responding for 83% on student not observed.

Professional responses to item 2, "Students have had to register for a new schedule of courses each quarter," were as follows; professional observed 6 responding for 11%, professional not observed 51 responding for 89%. Student responses to item 2 were 64 responding for 18% on student observed and 290 responding for 81% on student not observed.

Professional responses to item 38, "Registration procedures have facilitated individual course selection of student," were as follows; professional observed 21 responding for 37% and professional not observed 35 responding for 63%.

Professional responses to item 6, "The number of courses offered each quarter has made student selection of courses difficult," were as follows; professional observed 1 responding for 2%, professional not observed 56 responding for 98%. Student responses to item 6 were 83 responding for 23% on student observed and 269 responding for 75% student not observed.

Professional responses to item 29, "Most sequential course offerings have been eliminated", were as follows; professional observed responding for 2%, professional not observed 51 responding for 98%.

Professional responses to item 8, "Seasonal extra-curricular activities have prohibited students from taking full advantage of the quarter plan", were as follows; professional observed 2 responding for 4%, professional not observed 55 responding for 96%. Student responses to item 8 were 53 responding for 15% on student observed and 298 responding for 83% on student not observed.

Revised Curriculum

In Decatur High School, only 146 students or 41% of those who responded marked that on item 3 that they had observed that "Some courses that were offered last year were not offered this year." On item 4, "New courses have been added to the program this year," 183 students or 51% of those who responded observed that they had. Only 20% of the teachers who responded to item 3 marked "observed", and only 43% of the teachers who responded to item 4 marked "observed".

Table 3-6

Number and Percent of Recorded Critical Incident Observations Referring to Revised Curriculum Items by Students and Professionals in the Decatur City School System

Item Number	Student Observed		Student Not Observed		Professional Observed		Professional Not Observed	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
31					34	61	22	39
26					18	32	39	68
34					31	56	24	44
32					31	54	26	46
3	146	41	203	57	11	20	44	80
39					15	27	40	73
4	183	51	167	47	24	43	32	57

In responding to the remaining items, the percentage of the teachers who responded who marked "observed" ranged from 32% in item 26, to 61% in item 31; 54% for item 32; 56% for 34, and 27% for 39.

Gwinnett County School System

On hundred and eighty-seven usable responses to the professional observation form were returned by members of the professional staffs of the secondary schools in the Gwinnett County School System. There were 1169 usable student observation forms returned from the Gwinnett County high schools. All of the Gwinnett County high schools were represented in this sample.

Administrative Variables

Professional responses to item 41, "There was no time during the year to effect needed remodeling and repairs of the school building," ranged from 5 responding for 20% to 0 responding for 0% on professional observations. On professional not observed the range was 23 responding for 100% to 20 responding for 80%. For the total system 16 responded for 8% on professional observed and 175 responded for 92% on professional not observed.

Professional responses to item 1, "The completion of necessary remodeling and repairs of the school has disrupted school activities," ranged from 9 responding for 26% to 1 responding for 6% on professional observed. On professional not observed the range was 15 responding for 94% to 25 responding for 74%. For the total system 32 responded for 18% on professional observed and 144 responded for 82% on professional not observed.

Student responses on item 1 ranged from 108 responding for 58% to 25 responding for 15% on student observations. On students not observed the range was 143 responding for 84% to 77 responding for 42%. For the total system 420 responded for 36% on student observed and 734 responded for 63% on student not observed.

Professional responses to item 12, "Individuals have been brought in to teach special courses on a part-time basis," ranged from 17 responding for 21% to 1 responding for 4% on professional observed. On professional not observed the range was 22 responding for 96% to 27 responding for 79%. For the total system 24 responded for 14% on professional observed and 151 responded for 86% on professional not observed.

Table 4-1

Number and Percent of Recorded Critical Incident Observations Referring to Administrative Variable Items by Students and Professionals in the Gwinnett County School System

Item Number	Student Observed		Student Not Observed		Professional Observed		Professional Not Observed	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
41					16	8	175	92
1	420	36	734	63	32	18	144	82
12	277	24	874	75	24	14	151	86
33					9	6	159	94
42					22	13	148	87
43					79	45	95	55
25					42	25	126	75

Student responses to item 12 ranged from 33 responding for 36% to 32 responding for 13% on student observed. On student not observed the range was 208 responding for 87% to 59 responding for 64%. For the total system 277 responded for 24% on student observed and 874 responded for 75% on student not observed.

Professional responses to item 33, "The quarter system has provided increased state financing," ranged from 4 responding for 13% to 0 responding for 0% on professional observed. On professional not observed the range was 30 responding for 100% to 28 responding for 87%. For the total system, 9 responded for 6% on professional observed and 159 responded for 94% on professional not observed.

Professional responses to item 42, "Expenditures per pupil have declined because students may complete graduation requirements in a shorter period of time," ranged from 7 responding for 30% to 0 responding for 0% for professional observed. On professional not observed the range was from 17 responding for 100% to 16 responding for 70%. For the total system 22 responded for 13% on professional observed and 148 responded for 87% on professional not observed.

Professional responses to item 43, "A great deal of record keeping is an inherent quality of the quarter system," ranged from 19 responding for 56% to 2 responding for 12% on professional observed. On professional not observed the range was 15 responding for 88% to 15 responding for 44%. For the total system 79 responded for 45% on professional observed and 95 responded for 55% on professional not observed.

Professional responses to item 25, "Additional administrative functions have been required to operate the quarter system," ranged from 9 responding for 39% to 1 responding for 6% on professional observed. On professional not observed the range was 16 responding for 94% to 14 responding for 61%. For the total system 42 responded for 25% on professional observed and 126 responded for 75% on professional not observed.

Social Implications

Student responses to item 9, "Students have graduated and left school at the end of each of four quarters," ranged from 189 or 79% in one school to a low of 4 or 25% in another. The total student responses were 786 or 86% had observed and 368 or 32% had not. Total teacher responses were 117 or 68% had observed and 55 or 32% had not observed.

Item 15, "Students have chosen to take different quarters off from school to be employed full time," was marked "observed" by 70 students or 40% of those who responded in one school and 24 students or 10% of those who responded in another. In two of the schools

Table 4-2

Number and Percent of Recorded Critical Incident Observations Referring to Social Implication Items by Students and Professionals in the Gwinnett County School System

Item Number	Student Observed		Student Not Observed		Professional Observed		Professional Not Observed	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
22	872	75	279	24	150	84	28	16
9	786	68	368	32	117	68	55	32
23	149	13	1003	86	10	6	168	94
15	270	23	881	96	18	10	158	90
5								
37					24	14	146	86

none of the teachers who responded marked "observed". The highest number of "observed" responses from teachers was 8 or 35% in one school.

Total student response was 270 or 23% had observed and 881 or 76% had not observed. Of all the teachers who responded, only 18 or 10% had observed and 158 or 90% had not.

To item 22, "Students have completed high school in less than four calendar years," a total of 872 students or 75% marked "observed". These totals included a narrow range of responses from 136 or 80% of those who responded marked "had observed" in one school to 172 or 72% who marked "had observed". The total number of teachers who marked "had observed" was 150 or 84%. As many as 24 or 96% in one school had observed. In two other schools 71% had observed.

Item 23, "Students have taken their vacation during different quarters of the year," resulted in very low percentages of students and teachers who marked "observed." Forty-five students in one school or 26% had observed. In another school only 4 students or 4% had observed. The total student responses for the system show that only 149 students or 13% had observed, and 1003 or 86% had not observed. The highest percentage of teachers who marked observed was 17% in one school. In three schools which participated, none of the teachers who responded marked "observed". The total teacher response to this item in Gwinnett was 10 teachers or 6% who marked "observed" and 16 or 94% marked "not observed".

Item 37, "The dropout rate had declined," was included on the professional instrument only. The highest percentage of "observed" responses in any school was 43% or 6 teachers. The lowest percentage which marked "observed" was 4% or one teacher. The totals responses indicate that 24 teachers or 14% had observed and 146 or 86% had not observed.

Professional Enhancement

In Gwinnett County 65% of the students who responded to item 5 indicated that they had observed that, "Students had received help from subject area teachers in selecting courses." Seventy-eight percent of the teachers who responded to this item had also observed this. Thirty-eight students in the system or 22% of those who responded marked observed for item 27. This 22% represents a range of 43% in each of two schools to 7% in another.

Nine teachers or 64% of those who responded in one school and 10 students or 33% of those who responded in another school indicated that they had observed that, "Professionals had been informed of the concepts and purposes of the quarter system" Of those who responded to item 28, 47% had observed this.

Table 4-3

Number and Percent of Recorded Critical Incident Observations Referring to Professional Enhancement Items by Students and Professionals in the Gwinnett County School System

Item Number	Student Observed		Student Not Observed		Professional Observed		Professional Not Observed	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
28					78	48	98	52
30					6	3	168	97
40					59	34	116	66
36					53	31	120	69
27					38	22	136	78
35					119	68	57	32
5	760	65	394	34	137	78	38	22

Only six teachers in the county, 3% of those who responded, have observed that, "Teachers have taken different quarters off for professional improvement." All six of these teachers responding to item 30 are in one school. Twenty-five teachers or 83% of those who responded to item 35 in one school and 18 teachers or 55% in another school have observed that, "Teachers are assigned courses they most like to teach." In the system 68% of those who responded had observed this.

Only 31% of the teachers in Gwinnett who responded to item 36 agreed that, "The time between quarters was too short to schedule needed in-service programs."

Thirty-four percent of the teachers who responded from Gwinnett to item 40 marked "observed". This represents a range of 19 teachers or 54% in one school to 2 teachers or 12% in another.

Program Flexibility

Only 31% of the students in the system who responded to item 7 marked "observed." The percentages in individual schools of those students who responded with "observed" varied from a high of 54% to a low of 19%. Teacher responses varied even more. In one school 85% of the teachers who responded marked observed. Of all teachers who responded in the system, 53% or 92 marked "observed".

The range of responses to item 10, "Enrichment courses have allowed students to pursue special interest," were not as wide as for item 7. Of the students who responded in individual schools, 56 students or 61% in one school had observed and only 29% of those who responded in another school. In the entire system, 43% of the teachers who responded marked observed and 57% had not observed.

As many as 77% of the students who responded in one school marked "observed" for item 11. However, in another school only 42% of those who responded marked "observed." Sixty-three percent of all of the students in Gwinnett who responded had marked "observed". The teacher response for the system was very close to the student response. Of all teachers who responded, 66% marked "observed." As many as 84% of the teachers in one school who responded had observed and as few as 38% in another school had observed.

Never more than 45% of the students who responded in any one school marked "observed" for item 16. As many as 61% of the teachers who responded in one school marked that they had observed that, "Individual programs were designed from a wide variety of courses". In the entire system of the students and teachers who responded, 407 students or 35% and 73 teachers or 42% marked "observed".

Table 4-4

Number and Percent of Recorded Critical Incident Observations Referring to Program Flexibility Items by Students and Professionals in the Gwinnett County School System

Item Number	Student Observed		Student Not Observed		Professional Observed		Professional Not Observed	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
16	407	35	742	64	73	42	102	58
7	355	31	801	69	92	53	80	47
10	581	50	573	49	76	43	101	57
17	233	20	919	79	65	37	112	63
11	735	63	418	36	117	66	59	34

Very few students in Gwinnett had observed that, "Programs had been tailored for individual students." The responses to item 17 indicate that of the students who responded in the individual schools, 25% in one school and 4% in another marked "observed". Only 37% of the teachers who responded in the entire system marked "observed".

Scheduling Flexibility

Professional responses to item 20, "Courses failed have been made up in the summer quarter," ranged from 32 responding for 91% to 25 responding for 74% on professional observed. On professional not observed the range was 9 responding for 26% to 3 responding for 9%. For the entire system 147 responded for 83% on professional observed and 30 responded for 17% on professional not observed.

Student responses to item 20 ranged from 212 responding for 88% to 124 responding for 71% on student observed. On student not observed the range was 49 responding for 28% to 27 responding for 11%. For the total system 972 responded for 84% on student observed and 177 responded for 15% on student not observed.

Professional responses to item 13, "Courses failed have been made up during the following year," ranged from 33 responding for 94% to 11 responding for 65% on professional observed. On professional not observed the range was 6 responding for 35% to 2 responding for 6%. For the total system 148 responded for 81% on professional observed and 35 responded for 19% on professional not observed.

Student responses to item 13 ranged from 216 responding for 90% to 147 responding for 79% on student observed. On student not observed the range was 35 responding for 19% to 23 responding for 10%. For the total system 989 responded for 85% to student observed and 177 responded for 15% to student not observed.

Professional response to item 21, "Students have made up failures in each quarter of the year," ranged from 19 responding for 83% to 8 responding for 57% on professional observed. On professional not observed the range was 6 responding for 43% to 4 responding for 17%. For the total system 130 responded for 73% to professional observed and 48 responded for 27% to professional not observed.

Student response to item 21 ranged from 64 responding for 71% to 27 responding for 29% on student observed. For student not observed the range was 68 responding for 36% to 27 responding for 29%. For the total system 763 responded for 60% on student observed and 390 responded for 34%.

Professional response to item 24, "Students take courses any quarter and in any order," ranged from 7 for 299, to 0 responding for 0% on professional observed. On professional not observed the range was 13 for 100% to 17 observed and 147 responding for 84% on professional not observed.

Student response to item 24 ranged from 60 responding for 35% to 38 responding for 16% on student observed. On student not observed 201 responded for 84% to 108 responding for 64%. For the total system 2% responded for 25% on student observed and 861 responded for 74% on student not observed.

Professional responses to item 14, "Students take most courses any quarter and in any order," ranged from 74 responding for 44% to 57 responding for 24% on professional observed. On professional not observed the range was from 182 responding for 76% to 94 responding for 55%. For the total system 28 responded for 16% on professional observed and 147 responded for 84% on professional not observed.

Student responses to item 14 ranged from 75 responding for 44% to 57 responding for 24% on student observed. For student not observed the range was 182 responding for 76% to 94 responding for 55%. For the total system 290 responded for 25% for student observed and 861 responded for 74% for student not observed.

Professional responses to item 2, "Students have had to register for a new schedule of courses each quarter," ranged from 4 responding for 31% to 4 responding for 13% on professional observed. On professional not observed the range was 26 responding for 87% to 9 responding for 69%. For the total system 38 responded for 22% on professional observed and 138 responded for 78% on professional not observed.

Student response to item 2 ranged from 64 responding for 38% to 48 responding for 20% on student observed. For student not observed the range was 192 responding for 80% to 104 responding for 61%. For the total system 316 responded for 27% on student observed and 839 responded for 72% on student not observed.

Professional responses to item 38, "Registration procedures have facilitated individual course selection by students," ranged from 16 responding for 64% to 6 responding for 35% for professional observed. For professional not observed the range was 11 responding for 65% to 9 responding for 36%. For the total system 100 responded for 57% on professional observed and 76 responded for 43% on professional not observed.

Professional responses to item 6, "The number of courses offered each quarter has made student selection of courses difficult," ranged from 3 responding for 21% to 1 responding for 4% on professional observed. On professional not observed the range was 24 responding for 96% to 11 responding for 79%. For the total system 23 responded for 13% on professional observed and 155 responded for 81% on professional not observed.

Student responses to item 6 ranged from 73 responding for 39% to 41 responding for 24% on student observed. On student not observed the range was 128 responding for 75% to 110 responding for 59%. For the total system 359 responded for 31% on student observed and 796 responded for 69% on student not observed.

Table 4-5

Number and Percent of Recorded Critical Incident Observations Referring to Scheduling Flexibility Items by Students and Professionals in the Gwinnett County School System

Item Number	Student Observed		Student Not Observed		Professional Observed		Professional Not Observed	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
20	972	84	177	15	147	83	30	17
13	989	85	163	14	148	81	35	19
21	763	66	390	34	130	73	48	27
24	290	25	861	74	28	16	147	84
14	378	33	774	67	28	06	147	84
2	316	27	839	72	38	22	138	78
38					100	57	76	43
6	359	31	796	69	23	13	155	87
29					26	15	152	85
8	180	16	970	84	25	14	152	86
19	230	20	919	79	13	7	164	93

Professional responses to item 29, "Most sequential course offerings have been eliminated," ranged from 6 responding for 24% to 3 responding for 8% on professional observed. For professional not observed the range was 33 responding for 92% to 19 responding for 76%. For the total system 26 responded for 15% on professional observed and 152 responded for 85% on professional not observed.

Professional responses to item 8, "Seasonal extra-curricular activities have prohibited students from taking full advantage of the quarter plan," ranged from 6 responding for 24% to 2 responding for 6% for professional observed. On professional not observed the range was 33 responding for 94% to 14 responding for 76%. For the total system 25 responded for 14% on professional observed and 152 responded for 80% on professional not observed.

Student response to item 8 ranged from 20 responding for 22% to 22 responding for 13% on student observed. On student not observed the range was from 146 responding for 86% to 72 responding for 78%. For the total system 180 responded for 16% on student observed and 970 responded for 84% on student not observed.

Professional response to item 19, "The regular summer quarter has increased student participation," ranged from 2 responding for 14% to 0 responding for 0% for professional observed. On professional not observed the range was 30 responding for 100% to 12 responding for 80%. For the total system 13 responded for 7% on professional observed and 164 responded for 93% on professional not observed.

Student responses to item 19 ranged from 2 responding for 14% to 0 responding for 0% for student observed. For student not observed the range was 30 responding for 100% to 12 responding for 86%. For the total system 230 responded for 20% on student observed and 919 responded for 79% on student not observed.

Curriculum Revision

Student response to item 3 showed that 62 students or 56% of those who responded in one school had observed and only 22 students or 12% of those who responded in another school had observed. To item 4 the number of students who had observed ranged from 83 or 75% of those who responded in one school to 28 or 30% of those who responded in another school. The system totals for these two items showed that 882 students or 38% had observed and 1425 students or 61% had not observed. The number of teachers who responded that they had observed in item 3 ranged from 6 or 26% of those who responded in one school to only 1 or 6% of those who observed in another. Those who marked "had observed" to item 4 ranged from 10 or 71% of those who responded in one school to 5 or 29% in another. Twenty-nine teachers or 16% of those who responded to item 3 in the system had observed and 149 or 84% of those who responded had not.

To item 4 in the 7 responding schools in the system 97 teachers or 55% of those who responded had observed and 80 or 45% of those who responded had not.

The teacher response of "observed" to item 26, ranged from 11 to 44% of those who responded in another. Fifty-five teachers or 31% of those who responded in the entire system had observed and 122 or 69% of those who responded had not.

The range of "observed" responses to item 31 was even wider: No teachers in one school to 11 or 81% of those who responded in another. The totals show that 29 or 16% of those who responded had observed and 148 or 84% of those who responded had not observed. The highest percentage of teachers who responded had observed to item 32, "Course revisions have been made this year," was 54% of those who responded or 19 teachers. The lowest percentage was 33% of those who responded or 10 teachers. The total response to this item was 79 or 45% of those who observed had observed and 98 or 55% of those who observed had not observed.

The teacher response of "observed" to item 34, ranged from 23 or 77% of those who responded in one school to 11 or 31% of those who responded in another. In the system 75 teachers or 43% of those who responded had observed and 100 or 57% had not.

The last item for teachers relating to curriculum revision was number 39, "Location of a suitable textbook has been of prime importance in the development of a new course guide." Of those teachers who responded in the seven schools, 9 or 48% in one school had observed and only 5 or 14% in another had observed. Of all the teachers in the system who responded, 49 or 28% had observed and 124 or 72% had not.

Table 4-6

Number and Percent of Recorded Critical Incident Observations Referring to Revised Curriculum Items by Students and Professionals in the Gwinnett County School System

Item Number	Student Observed		Student Not Observed		Professional Observed		Professional Not Observed	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
31					29	16	148	84
26					55	31	122	69
34					75	43	100	57
32					79	45	98	55
3	243	21	910	78	29	16	149	84
4	639	55	515	44	97	55	80	45
39					49	28	124	72

Chapter Three

Summary

In response to a growing nationwide interest in the four-quarter school year in metropolitan Atlanta secondary schools, and in response to an often expressed need for an assessment of local progress of the four-quarter plan, this project was conceived and conducted. Because of the four-quarter plan as implemented in metropolitan Atlanta is unique among attempts at extended year programs in that it was not designed for fiscal reasons, considerable attention was given to precise definition of its specific objectives.

For this reason an extensive pilot study was conducted. Interviews with selected influential citizens, superintendents, steering committee members, principals and counselors; and questionnaires completed by teachers, students, and parents yielded an enormous amount of data concerning the objectives, concerns, and expectations of the four-quarter school year. Analysis of this data produced five major expectations and one major concern which were predominant underlying factors in the adoption and implementation of the four-quarter school year in metropolitan Atlanta. The five major expectations were curriculum revision, program flexibility, scheduling flexibility, social implications, and professional enhancement. The major concern centered around certain administrative variables

An instrument was designed utilizing the critical incident technique. An item analysis of the instrument was conducted to insure the valid inclusion of all the major expectations and the major concern. The instrument was then field tested. Two forms of the instrument were developed. the professional observation form and the student observation form.

The instruments were distributed to all of the professional staff members and to all of the juniors and seniors in Atlanta City, Clayton County, Decatur City, and Gwinnett County secondary schools. Responses were received from 31 of the 38 high schools.

Additional data describing the operational four-quarter plan were fathered through interviews, questionnaires, and a review of numerous school documents.

Conclusions

The absence of baseline data upon which to compare the results of the survey presented a problem in the interpretation of the data. In order to provide some insight into the possible implications of the results of the survey an arbitrary judgment was made to present those items with extreme loadings. In the discussion which follows below, items which were observed by 25% or less, and those items which were observed by 75% or more of the professionals or students in one of the participating school systems are cited.

Two immediate concerns with this interpretation were recognized. First, it might well be argued that one observation would be sufficient to establish reality, and second, the range between schools within a system is often so great that the use of system totals is questionable.

Administrative Variables

In Atlanta two items were observed by less than 25% of the responding professional staff members. Item 13, "Courses failed have been made up during the following year," was observed by 13% of the professionals. Item 18, "Students have chosen to attend all four quarters of the school," was observed by 18% of the professionals.

Only 12% of the students in Clayton County reported observation of item 1, "The completion of necessary remodeling and repairs of the school has disrupted school activities." Seven percent of the professional staff made this observation. Item 17, "Programs have been tailored for individual students," was marked observed by 17% of the responding professionals. Eleven percent of the professional staff recorded observations of item 12, "Individuals have been brought in to teach special courses on a part-time basis." Two percent reported that, "The quarter system has provided increased state financing." Item 42, "Expenditures per pupil have declined because students may complete graduation requirements in a shorter period of time," was reported as observed by 10% of the Clayton County professionals.

Students in Decatur recorded a 12% observation of item 1, "The completion of necessary remodeling and repairs of the school has disrupted school activities." Twenty-three percent of the professionals shared this observation. Only 7% of the professionals and 21% of the students reported an observation on item 12, "Individuals have been brought in to teach special courses on a part-time basis." Thirteen percent of the professionals observed item 41, "There has been no time during the year to effect needed remodeling and repairs of the school building." Only 2% of the professional staff observed item 33, "The quarter system has provided increased state financing," and item 42, "Expenditures per pupil have declined because students may complete graduation requirements in a shorter period of time." That, "Additional administrative functions have been required to operate the quarter system," was observed by 9% of the professional staff.

The results of the survey in Gwinnett County was an exact duplication of the results just described with the exception of item 1, "The completion of necessary remodeling and repairs of the school has disrupted school activities." Thirty-six percent of the students shared this observation.

Social Implications

A pattern was apparent in the responses to item of this factor. Less than 25% of the professionals in each of the counties reported observations of item 23, "Students have taken their vacations during different quarters of the year, item 15, "Students have chosen to take different quarters off from school to be employed full time," and item 37, "The dropout rate has declined."

Student responses correlate on items 23 and 15 except in Atlanta, where 31% observed item 15. Additional extremes were noted in the professionals in Decatur who did not report a single observation of

item 9, "Students have graduated and left school at the end of each of the four quarters," and in Gwinnett where more than 75% of both the students and the professionals responded as having observed item 32, "Students have completed high school in less than four calendar years."

Professional Enhancement

The pattern that emerges here is related to three of the items - 5, 27, and 30. More than 75% of the professionals in three of the four participating systems, Atlanta, Clayton and Gwinnett, have observed that, "Students have received help in selecting courses from subject area teachers." Less than 25% of the professionals in each of the four school systems observed that, "Teachers have taken different quarters off for professional improvement through either graduate studies or other enrichment experiences." Only in Atlanta did more than 25% of the professionals report observing that, "The quarter system has allowed for effective utilization of teacher's special abilities."

Program Flexibility

Only two items from this category received extreme loadings. In Atlanta 75% of the professionals reported that, "Work experience has been provided through cooperative programs regardless of the student's future educational plans." Only 25% of the Decatur professionals made this observation. Less than 25% of the students in Clayton and Gwinnett Counties observed that, "Programs have been tailored for individual students."

Scheduling Flexibility

More than 75% of the students in each of the four school systems reported that, "Courses failed have been made up in the summer quarter." Only in Decatur did 75% of the professionals not agree with this observation.

With the exception of Atlanta, more than 75% of the students and professionals observed that, "Courses failed have been made up during the following year."

Seventy-seven percent of the professionals in Clayton county reported that, "Students take courses any quarter and in any order."

Less than 25% of the professionals in Gwinnett and Decatur and 15% of the students in Decatur reported, "Students take most courses any quarter and in any order." Seventy-six percent of the Atlanta professionals reported, "Students have had to register for a new schedule of courses each quarter." Less than 25% of the students and professionals in Decatur and of the professionals in Gwinnett made this report.

Less than 25% of all the professionals and of the students in Decatur reported, "The number of courses offered each quarter has made student selection of courses difficult." Less than 25% of the professionals in Gwinnett and Decatur reported, "Most sequential course offerings have been eliminated."

Less than 25% of all groups reported, "Seasonal extra-curricular activities have prohibited students from taking full advantage of the quarter plan." Also, with the exception of Atlanta students, less than 25% of all groups observed that, "The regular summer quarter has increased the number of extra-curricular events and has promoted increased student participation."

Curriculum Revision

Less than 25% of the professionals in Atlanta and Gwinnett reported that, "Teachers have written new course guides this year." Less than 25% of the professionals in Decatur, of the students in Clayton County, and of the students and professionals in Gwinnett County reported that, "Some courses that were offered last year were not offered this year."

Notes

- 1 Joint Committee of Atlanta, DeKalb, and Fulton County Schools, 3 R's The All-Year School Plan, (Atlanta: Joint Committee of Atlanta, DeKalb, and Fulton County Schools, May 1957).
- 2 Ibid.
- 3 Supplementary Educational Center, Today's Challenge - Tomorrow's Opportunity, (Atlanta: Supplementary Educational Center, 1968).
- 4 Supplementary Education Center, Metropolitan Atlanta Region, "Four-Quarter School Year," (Supplementary Education Center, Metropolitan Atlanta Region, 1969), pp. 10-15.
- 5 Ibid.
- 6 H. R. Vanderslice, "Five Years' Experience With the All-Year School," (December, 1933), p. 257.
- 7 Mary Jane McReynolds, A Conceptual Design for the Implementation of the Four-Quarter Plan of Organization in the Elementary Schools of an Urban School System, (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Florida, Gainesville, 1970), p. 37, citing H. S. Irons, "Utilizing Buildings and Instructional Materials 12 Months Annually," American School Board Journal, (March, 1934), p. 19.
- 8 Mary Jane McReynolds, p. 34, citing George Peabody College for Teachers, Division of Surveys and Field Studies, The All-Year School of Nashville, Tennessee, Field Services No. 3, (Nashville: Georgia Peabody College for Teachers, Division of Surveys and Field Studies, 1931), p. vii.
- 9 Clarence A. Schoenfeld and Neil Schmitz, Year Round Education, (Madison, Wisconsin: Dembar Educational Research Services, 1964), p. 14.
- 10 John McLain, "Developing Flexible All-Year Schools," Educational Leadership, (February, 1971), p. 474.
- 11 Ibid.
- 12 Vernon D. MacPherson, "Keeping Schools Open All Year," Nation's Schools, (September, 1955), p. 62.
- 13 Ibid. p. 60.

- 14 Joint Committee of Atlanta, DeKalb, and Fulton County Schools, 3 R's, The All-Year School Plan, (Atlanta: Joint Committee of Atlanta, DeKalb and Fulton County Schools, May, 1957).
- 15 McLain, p. 474.
- 16 Ibid.
- 17 Alvin N. Zachrich, "These Misgivings Make Me Hesitate," Nation's Schools, (November, 1967), p. 69.
- 18 Anthony W. Scala, "Year-Round School", NASSP Bulletin, (March, 1970), p. 82.
- 19 Horace C. Hartsell, "The Twelve Month School," NASSP Bulletin, (December, 1953), p. 28.
- 20 Andrew S. Adams, "Criticisms of the Year Round School Can Be Answered," Nation's Schools, (November, 1970), p. 70.
- 21 William J. Fitzpatrick, "The All-Year School, Pro and Con," School and Society, (April 26, 1958), p. 191.
- 22 W. Scott Bauman, "Four-Quarter Plan Uses Schools All Year Long," Nation's Schools, (November, 1967), p. 69.
- 23 "Los Angeles Rejects Plan for Keeping Schools Open Year-Round; Calls It Costly, Inconvenient," Nation's Schools, (February, 1955), p. 122.
- 24 Florida Research and Development Council, Year-Round Schools for Polk County, Florida: A Feasibility Study, (Gainesville, Florida: The Educational Research and Development Council, 1966), p. 46.
- 25 Adams, p. 70.
- 26 "Los Angeles Rejects . . .", p. 122.
- 27 Florida Research and Development Council, pp. 24-5.
- 28 Fitzpatrick, p. 192.
- 29 Ibid.
- 30 Florida Research and Development Council, pp. 24-5.
- 31 Ibid., p. 25
- 32 Ibid., p. 46.

- 33 NEA, The Rescheduled School Year, p. 13, citing Florida State Department of Education, The All-Year School, (Tallahassee, Florida: Florida State Department of Education), 1957.
- 34 "Los Angeles Rejects . . .", p. 122.
- 35 Atlanta Board of Education, The Four-Quarter School Year in the Atlanta Public Schools, (Atlanta Board of Education, 1970), pp. 19-22.
- 36 Supplementary Education Center, Metropolitan Atlanta Region, p. 15.
- 37 Fulton County Board of Education, Fulton County Schools Four-Quarter Plan, (Atlanta, Fulton County Board of Education, 1970), p. 1.
- 38 Hartsell, p. 23.
- 39 Vanderslice, p. 258.
- 40 Schoenfeld and Schmitz, p. 14.
- 41 McReynolds, p. 35.
- 42 Theodore Bienstok, "Resistance to Educational Innovation," Elementary School Journal, (May, 1965), p. 425.
- 43 John Lombardi, "The Los Angeles Study of Year-Round Operation," Theory Into Practice, (June, 1962), p. 135.
- 44 Florida Research and Development Council, p. 55.
- 45 "All Year Schools Can Wait", Nation's Schools, (March, 1964), p. 84.
- 46 Zachrich, p. 69.
- 47 Andrew Adams, "Look Hard at This Year-Round School Plan", American School Board Journal, (July, 1968), p. 12.
- 48 Adams, "Criticism of Year Round School Can Be Answered," p. 70.
- 49 Hartsell, p. 21.
- 50 Bauman, p. 69.
- 51 Fulton County Board of Education, p. 1.
- 52 Atlanta Board of Education, p. 20.
- 53 Bauman, p. 70.

- 54 Scala, p. 80.
- 55 Zachrich, p. 69.
- 56 Adams, p. 70.
- 57 Adams, p. 70.
- 58 Vanderslice, p. 262.
- 59 Adams, p. 70.
- 60 Paul J. Misner, "Teachers' Role in an All-Year Program",
NEA Journal, (November 1948), pp. 500-501.
- 61 Bauman, p. 70.
- 62 Florida Research and Development Council, p. 48.
- 63 "All Year Schools Can Wait", p. 84.
- 64 Frank B. May, "Year-Round Schools; A Proposal, Elementary
School Journal, (April, 1961), p. 389.
- 65 Scala, p. 81.
- 66 Rebecca Dennard, "The Twelve-Month Four-Quarter School Year",
JOPHER (October, 1969), p. 58.
- 67 Fulton County Board of Education, pp. 8-59.
- 68 Atlanta Board of Education, pp. 1-17.
- 69 MACCE, I.
- 70 Hartsell, p. 27.
- 71 Ibid., p. 38.
- 72 Vanderslice, p. 261.
- 73 McReynolds, p. 29.
- 74 Ibid.
- 75 Bauman, p. 70.
- 76 May, p. 391.

- 77 Scala, p. 83.
- 78 MACCE, pp. I-1 - X10.
- 79 Dennard, p. 57.
- 80 May, p. 391.
- 81 McLain, p. 474.
- 82 Atlanta Board of Education, p. 19.
- 83 Misner, p. 501.
- 84 Atlanta Board of Education, p. 4.
- 85 Fulton County Board of Education, p. 1.
- 86 Henson, E. Curtis, The Four-Quarter School Year in the Atlanta Public Schools, (Atlanta: Atlanta Board of Education, January, 1970), pp. 7-14.

Bibliography

- Adams, Andrew S. "Criticisms of the Year-Round School Can Be Answered," Nation's Schools, (November, 1970), 70-73.
- _____. "Look Hard at This Year-Round School Plan," American School Board Journal, (July, 1968), 12-14.
- "All Year Schools Can Wait." Nation's Schools, (November, 1967), 68-70.
- Atlanta Board of Education. Curriculum Catalogue Quarter Courses. Atlanta: Atlanta Board of Education. 1970.
- Bienstock, Theodore. "Resistance to Educational Innovation." Elementary School Journal, (May, 1965), 425-7.
- Dennard, Rebecca. "The Twelve-Month Four Quarter School Year," Journal of Health and Physical Education Review, (October, 1969), 58-59.
- Fitzpatrick, William J. "The All-Year School, Pro and Con," School and Society, (April 26, 1958), 191-192.
- Florida Research and Development Council. Year-Round Schools for Polk County, Florida: A Feasibility Study. Gainesville: The Educational Research and Development Council, 1966.
- Fulton County Board of Education. Fulton County Schools Four-Quarter Plan. Atlanta: Fulton County Board of Education, 1970.
- George Peabody College for Teachers, Divisions of Surveys and Field Studies. The All-Year School of Nashville, Tennessee. Field Services No. 3. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, Division of Surveys and Field Studies, 1931.
- Hartsell, Horace C. "The Twelve-Month School," NASSP Bulletin, (December, 1953), 18-33.
- Henson, E. Curtis, The Four-Quarter School Year in the Atlanta Public Schools, (Atlanta: Atlanta Board of Education, January, 1970).
- Joint Committee of Atlanta, DeKalb, and Fulton County Schools. 3 R's, The All-Year School Plan. Atlanta: Atlanta, DeKalb, and Fulton County Schools, 1957.

- Lombardi, John. "The Los Angeles Study of Year-Round Operation," Theory Into Practice, (June, 1962), 135-136.
- "Los Angeles Rejects Plan for Keeping Schools Open Year-Round; Calls It Costly, Inconvenient." Nation's Schools, (February, 1955), 122-124.
- MacPherson, Vernon D. "Keeping Schools Open All Year", Nation's Schools, (September, 1955), 60-62.
- McLain, John. "Developing Flexible All Year Schools," Educational Leadership, (February, 1971), 473-475.
- MacReynolds, Mary Jane. A Conceptual Design for the Implementation of the Four-Quarter Plan of Organization in the Elementary Schools of an Urban School System. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Florida, Gainesville, 1970.
- May, Frank B. "Year Round Schools; A Proposal," Elementary School Journal. (April, 1961), 387-390.
- Metropolitan Atlanta Coordinating Council for Education. Inter-System Course Guide. Atlanta: MACCE.
- Misner, Paul J. "Teachers' Role in an All-Year Program," NEA Journal, (November, 1958), 500-501.
- National Education Association. The Reschedule School Year. Washington: NEA.
- Scala, Anthony W. "Year Round School," NASSP Bulletin, (March, 1970), 78-89.
- Schoenfeld, Clarence A., and Neil Schmitz. Year Round Education. Madison: Dembar Educational Research Services, 1964.
- Supplementary Education Center, Metropolitan Atlanta Region. Four-Quarter School Year. Atlanta: Supplementary Education Center, 1969.
- Vanderslice, H. R. "Five Years' Experience With the All-Year School," Elementary School Journal, (December, 1953), 256-268.
- Zachrich, Alvin N. "These Misgivings Make Me Hesitate," Nation's Schools, November, 1967.

Appendix

Student Observation Items

1. The completion of necessary remodeling and repairs of the school has disrupted school activities.
2. Students have had to register for a new schedule of courses each quarter.
3. Some courses that were offered last year were not offered this year.
4. New courses have been added to the program this year.
5. Students have received help in selecting courses from subject area teachers.
6. The number of courses offered each quarter has made student selection of courses difficult.
7. Courses have been offered for those students who need special help in a subject.
8. Seasonal extra-curricular activities have prohibited students from taking full advantage of the quarter plan.
9. Students have graduated and left school at the end of each of the four quarters.
10. Enrichment courses have allowed students to pursue special interests.
11. Work experience has been provided through cooperative programs regardless of the student's future educational plans.
12. Individuals have been brought in to teach special courses on a part-time basis.
13. Courses failed have been made up during the following year.
14. Students take most courses any quarter and in any order.
15. Students have chosen to take different quarters off from school to be employed full time.
16. Individual student's programs have been designed from a wide variety of courses.

17. Programs have been tailored for individual students.
18. Students have chosen to attend all four quarters of the school year.
19. The regular summer quarter has increased the number of extra-curricular events and has promoted increased student participation.
20. Courses failed have been made up in the summer quarter.
21. Students have made up failures in each quarter of the year.
22. Students have completed high school in less than four calendar years.
23. Students have taken their vacation during different quarters of the year.
24. Students take courses any quarter and in any order.

Professional Observation Items

1. The completion of necessary remodeling and repairs of the school has disrupted school activities.
2. Students have had to register for a new schedule of courses each quarter.
3. Some courses that were offered last year were not offered this year.
4. New courses have been added to the program this year.
5. Students have received help in selecting courses from subject area teachers.
6. The number of courses offered each quarter has made student selection of courses difficult.
7. Courses have been offered for those students who need special help in a subject.
8. Seasonal extra-curricular activities have prohibited students from taking full advantage of the quarter plan.
9. Students have graduated and left school at the end of each of the four quarters.
10. Enrichment courses have allowed students to pursue special interests.
11. Work experience has been provided through cooperative programs regardless of the student's future educational plans.
12. Individuals have been brought in to teach special courses on a part-time basis.
13. Courses failed have been made up during the following year.
14. Students take most courses any quarter and in any order.
15. Students have chosen to take different quarters off from school to be employed full time.
16. Individual student's programs have been designed from a wide variety of courses.

17. Programs have been tailored for individual students.
18. Students have chosen to attend all four quarters of the school year.
19. The regular summer quarter has increased the number of extra-curricular events and has promoted increased student participation.
20. Courses failed have been made up in the summer quarter.
21. Students have made up failures in each quarter of the year.
22. Students have completed high school in less than four calendar years.
23. Students have taken their vacations during different quarters of the year.
24. Students take courses any quarter and in any order.
25. Additional administrative functions have been required to operate the quarter system.
26. Teachers have developed new courses this year.
27. The quarter system has allowed for effective utilization of teacher's special abilities.
28. Professionals have been informed of the concepts and purposes of the quarter system.
29. Most sequential course offerings have been eliminated.
30. Teachers have taken different quarters off for professional improvement through either graduate studies or other enrichment experiences.
31. Teachers have written new course guides this year.
32. Course revisions have been made this year.
33. The quarter system has provided increased state financing.
34. Courses have been evaluated within the last year.
35. Teachers have been assigned to courses they most like to teach.
36. The time between quarters is so limited that it has been difficult to schedule needed in-service programs.
37. The dropout rate has declined.

38. Registration procedures have facilitated individual course selection by students.
39. Location of a suitable textbook has been of prime importance in the development of a new course guide.
40. Teachers have been employed for a full calendar year.
41. There has been no time during the year to effect needed remodeling and repairs of the school building.
42. Expenditures per pupil have declined because students may complete graduation requirements in a shorter period of time.
43. A great deal of record keeping is an inherent quality of the quarter system.